DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 330 HE 034 970

AUTHOR	Marcoux, Helene Elizabeth
TITLE	Kansas State University Faculty Perspective, Opinions, and Practices Concerning Undergraduate Student Academic Dishonesty and Moral Development.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	316p.; Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, Kansas State University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cheating; *Codes of Ethics; *College Faculty; College Students; Focus Groups; Higher Education; Knowledge Level; *Moral Values; Plagiarism; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; Teacher Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Kansas State University

ABSTRACT

A study with both quantitative and qualitative components was conducted with undergraduate teaching faculty at Kansas State University for fall 1999 to spring 2001 to study faculty role in addressing cheating at the collegiate level and faculty awareness of the University's honor system and cheating policies. Data were gathered through a variety of methods and techniques. Two focus groups involving 10 teaching faculty members helped refine a survey developed by the researcher, and a campus-wide survey was then conducted. From 339 to 365 responses per question were received from undergraduate teaching faculty. Offered in the survey was the opportunity to be interviewed about personal experiences with academically dishonest students, and 13 faculty members responded and were interviewed. The researcher also observed faculty members communicating information about academic dishonesty to students. Findings show that faculty perceptions about what constitutes cheating differ, suggesting the need for more dialogue among faculty members to develop a better consensus about what is academic dishonesty and what is acceptable behavior, especially in the area of collaboration. Most faculty members reported familiarity with the University's honor system, but only a minority indicated that they were familiar or very familiar with the policy or procedures of the system. National figures suggest that there is much cheating at the college level, and Kansas State University appears to have its share of episodes. However, faculty responses to this student behavior varied greatly, and they indicated that they had not received training in how to handle academic dishonesty. Some specific recommendations are made to provide further opportunities for faculty to discuss academic dishonesty and receive training in the honor system. Fifteen appendixes contain supplemental information and materials used in the surveys and interviews. (Contains 33 tables and 144 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

4E

ED 465 330

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSPECTIVE, OPINIONS, AND, PRACTICES CONCERNING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND MORAL DEVELOPMENT

by

HELENE ELIZABETH MARCOUX

B.S., North Texas State University, 1974
M.S., Emporia State University, 1986

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2002

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Marcoux

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE034970

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Much of the research on academic dishonesty heretofore has been conducted with a student perspective. A review of literature revealed a need for research on faculty's role in addressing cheating at the collegiate level, specifically the dissemination of information and the handling of student academic misconduct. Additionally, a deeper insight was needed into whether faculty use a student development perspective when addressing academic dishonesty issues.

This study has both quantitative and qualitative components and was conducted with participating undergraduate teaching faculty at Kansas State University (KSU) during four semesters from fall 1999 to spring 2001. Since KSU implemented a modified honor system in fall 1999, this study also partially describes faculty's awareness of its policy and procedures.

Data-gathering was conducted with a variety of methods and techniques. Initially, two focus groups of faculty helped to refine a survey designed by the researcher. The focus group transcripts turned into a rich source of data about faculty roles in relation to students' academic dishonesty. A campus-wide survey was then conducted on a population of full time, undergraduate teaching faculty. Offered in the survey the opportunity to be interviewed about personal experiences with academically dishonest student behavior, several faculty responded and were interviewed. Throughout the two-year study, the researcher also conducted first-day sessions to observe faculty practices in communicating information on academic dishonesty. Artifacts such as the university mission statement and instructor syllabi were also analyzed.

Analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data gathered from KSU undergraduate teaching faculty resulted in deeper insights into how participating faculty (1) made meaning of the term *academic dishonesty*; (2) responded to scenarios of student misconduct; (3) reported the dissemination of both verbal and written information about cheating and the KSU Undergraduate Honor System; (4) reported handling personal episodes of student cheating; (5) reported being trained or given orientation on academic dishonesty issues; and (6) whether faculty had a student development perspective when addressing academic misconduct.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSPECTIVE, OPINIONS, AND PRACTICES CONCERNING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND MORAL DEVELOPMENT

by

HELENE ELIZABETH MARCOUX

B.S., North Texas State University, 1974
M.S., Emporia State University, 1986

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2002

Approved by:

Dr. Gerald Hanna
Major Professor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COPYRIGHT

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSPECTIVE, OPINIONS, AND PRACTICES CONCERNING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND MORAL DEVELOPMENT

HELENE ELIZABETH MARCOUX

2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents i
List of Tables vii
Acknowledgments x
Dedication xii

Chapter I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1
Purpose of the Study 5
Guiding Questions of the Study 6
Definition of Terms 7
    Academic Dishonesty 7
    Student Moral Judgment Development 9
    Undergraduate Teaching Faculty 10
    Participating Faculty 10
    Faculty Perspective, Opinions, and Practices 10
Significance of the Study 11
  Setting 13
    Kansas State University 13
    Historical Context 14
Limitations of the Study 16

Chapter II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 17
Introduction 17
Ethical Theory 17
    Principle Ethics 17
    Casuistic Ethics 18
    Virtue Ethics 19
    Relational Ethics 20
Moral Judgment Development 21
    Lawrence Kohlberg 21
    Carol Gilligan 25
    James Rest 30
College Environment 33
    William Perry 33
    Earnest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini 36
    Arthur Chickering and Lori Reisser 37
Academic Dishonesty 38
    Introduction 38
    Description and Definition 39
    Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty 40
    Characteristics of Violators 42
    Circumstances Related to Academic Dishonesty 44
    Strategies for Controlling Academic Dishonesty 46
    Summary 49

Chapter III. METHODS AND PROCEDTURES 50
Introduction and Overview 50
Research Design 50
Researcher's Biases or Presuppositions 52
Components of the Study 54
    The Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Survey 54
        Description 54
        Rationale 55
        Participants 55
        Procedures 57
    Pilot Testing with Focus Groups 58
        Description 58
        Rationale 59
        Participants 59
        Procedures 60
    Pre-survey Evaluation 61
        Description 61
        Rationale 61
        Participants 62
        Procedures 62
    Survey Faculty Interviews 62
        Description 62
        Rationale 63
        Participants 63
        Procedures 63
    Non-participant Observation 64
        Description 64
        Rationale 65
        Selection of Classrooms to Observe 65
    Artifacts 66
        Description 66
        Rationale 66
        Selection of Artifacts 67
Instrumentation 67
    Questionnaire 67
        Construction 67
            Page 1 68
            Page 2 68
            Page 3 69
            Page 4 69
            Page 5 70
            Page 6 71
Analyses 71
    Analysis of Survey Data 71
    Analysis of Qualitative Components 72
Summary 76

Chapter 4. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS ... 78
- Introduction ... 78
- Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System ... 79
    - Definition of a Modified Honor System ... 79
    - Early History of the KSU Honor System ... 81
        - 1994 Principles of Biology 101 Cheating Episode ... 81
    - Structure and Implementation of the KSU Honor System ... 84
        - Beginnings ... 84
        - Mission Statement ... 84
        - The Honor Pledge ... 85
        - The Honor Council ... 85
        - Faculty Reporting Procedure ... 85
        - Case Procedure ... 86
        - H.I.P.E.-Believe It! ... 87
        - Case Adjudication ... 88
        - The XF Sanction ... 88
        - The Academic Integrity Course ... 88
        - The Honor System Web Site ... 89
        - Summary ... 91
- Demographics of Study Participants ... 92
    - Focus Group Participants ... 92
    - Survey Participants ... 93
    - Non-participant Observation Faculty ... 96
    - Self-Selected Survey Faculty Interview Participants ... 96
    - Summary ... 97
- Response Rates for the Campus-Wide Survey ... 97
    - Returned Questionnaires ... 97
        - Qualifying Faculty ... 97
    - Summary ... 98
- Addressing the Guiding Questions of the Study ... 98
    - Introduction ... 98
    - Question 1: How Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Make Meaning of the Term *Academic Dishonesty*? ... 100
        - Three-Box Exercise ... 100
            - Words most frequently used ... 100
            - Words depicting student behavior ... 101
            - Words depicting character or personality traits ... 102
            - Words depicting consequences of cheating ... 103
            - Unique words and phrases ... 104
        - Scenarios of Student Behavior ... 105
            - Scenario I ... 105
            - Scenario II ... 109
            - Scenario III ... 111
            - Scenario IV ... 113
        - Summary ... 115

Question 2: What Practices Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Engage in When Disseminating Information About Cheating? 115
    Faculty Familiarity with KSU Honor System 116
    Taking Time to *Discuss* What Constitutes Cheating 118
    Giving *Written* Instructions About What Constitutes Cheating 125
    How and *When* Information Is Disseminated 129
    Using the *Honor Pledge* As Information 133
    Using the *Honor System Web Site* As Information 137
    Summary 138
Question 3: How Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Handle Episodes of Cheating? 139
    Awareness of a Cheating Incident 139
    Types of Cheating Episodes and Class Size Noted 141
    Types of Sanctions Used 143
    Individual Faculty Interviews 146
    Detecting Episodes of Student Cheating 156
    Preventing Student Cheating 159
    Summary 162
Question 4: What Training or Orientation Have KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Had In Addressing Academic Dishonesty? 163
    Self-reported Training and Orientation 163
    Reported Types of Training and Orientation 164
    Summary 167
Question 5: What Perspective Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Have Concerning Student Moral Development Issues Relating to Episodes of Academic Dishonesty? 168
    Introduction 168
    Student Moral Development Opinions: Campus-wide Survey 169
    Student Moral Development Opinions: Observations, Interviews, and Focus Groups 177
    Messages to Students 185
    Summary 188

Chapter 5. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION 189
Introduction 189
Summary of Findings 189
    Introduction 189
    Setting 190
    Demographics 191
    Question 1: Meaning of the Term *Academic Dishonesty* 191

Question 2: Dissemination of Information 192
Question 3: Handling Episodes of Student Cheating 193
Question 4: Faculty Training and Orientation 194
Question 5: Awareness of Student Moral Judgment Development 195
Discussion With Recommendations 199
Introduction 199
Setting 199
The Principles of Biology 101 episode 199
The KSU Honor System 200
Demographics 200
Survey frame 200
Question 1: Meaning of the Term *Academic Dishonesty* 200
Findings 200
Recommendations 201
Question 2: Dissemination of Information 204
Findings 204
Recommendations 204
Question 3: Handling Episodes of Student Cheating 209
Findings 209
Recommendations 209
Question 4: Faculty Training and Orientation 213
Findings 213
Recommendations 213
Question 5: Awareness of Student Moral Judgment Dev't 217
Findings 217
Recommendations 218
Recommendations for KSU Student Development Specialists 223
Limitations of the Study 224
Suggestions for Further Study 225
Conclusion 227
References 232
Appendices: 248

Appendix A: -Kansas State University Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Academic Dishonesty Survey 248

Appendix B: - Kansas State University Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Academic Dishonesty Study Participant Matrix and College and Department Representation 255

Appendix C: - Survey Email #1 261

Appendix D: - Survey Email #2 263

Appendix E: - Survey Email #3 265

Appendix F: - Survey Email #4 267

Appendix G: - Focus Group and Survey Participant Contact Sheet 269

Appendix H: - Focus Group Informed Consent 271

Appendix I: - Focus Group Question Guide 273

Appendix J: - Faculty Interview Protocol 276

Appendix K: - Faculty Interview Informed Consent Form 278

Appendix L: - Non-participant Classroom Observation Summary Sheet 280

Appendix M: - Non-participant Classroom Observation Informed Consent 282

Appendix N: - Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System Violation Report 284

Appendix O: - Approval of Proposal by Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects 286

LIST OF TABLES

Tables .... Page

1 File Management Used in Study 73

2 Survey Participant Profile by Rank, Tenure, Gender, Ethnicity, Citizenship 94

3 Words or Phrases Depicting Student Behavior 102

4 Words or Phrases Depicting Student Character or Personality Trait.... 103

5 Words Depicting Consequencies of Cheating 103

6 Unique Words and Phrases.. 104

7 Q-19 Scenario 1-Talking About a Test After It Has Been Taken 106

8 Q-20 Scenario 2-Using a Book Review for Two Different Classes 109

9 Q-21 Scenario 3.-Using Old Tests Such as Those Kept in Greek Houses. 112

10 Q-22 Scenario 4. Reusing Lab Reports in Two Separate Semesters 114

11 Q-1 and Q-2 Faculty Self-reports on Familiarity with KSU's Honor System. 117

12 Q-4 Faculty Opinions on Student Knowledge About What Constitutes Cheating 119

13 Q-3 Faculty Opinion on Whether Instructors Should Take Class Time to Discuss What Constitutes Academic Dishonesty 120

14 Q-9 Faculty Self-reports on Average Time Talking About Cheating in Typical Class.. 121

15 Q-8 Faculty Self-reports on How Information Was Disseminated....... 121

16 Q-5 Faculty Self-reports on Written Dissemination of Information About Cheating 126

17 Q-10 Faculty Self-reports on When Information Was Disseminated ... 131

18 Q-11 Faculty Self-reports on Where They Place the Honor System Honor Pledge 134

19 Q-6 Faculty Perceptions on Students Asking Questions About Cheating........ 136

20 College Web Site Linkage to KSU Honor System Web Site Home Page 137

21 Q-12 Faculty Self-reports on Number of Cheating Incident(s) 140

22 Q-13 Faculty Self-reports of Types of Cheating. 141

23 Types of Violations and Class Enrollment When Each Occurred........ 142

24 Q-14 Typed of Sanctions Used........ 144

25 Q-26 Faculty Self-reports on Receiving Orientation on Cheating. 163

26 Q-27 Faculty Self-reports on Types of Orientation Received 164

27 Q-15 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Discussing Cheating Episode with Students. 169

28 Q-16 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Whether Students Learn From Sanctions. 170

29 Q-17 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Whether a Cheater Is Always a Cheater. 172

30 Q-18 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Teaching Students Ethical Behavior. 174

31 Mean and Standard Deviation for Survey Items Q-15 through Q-18 ... 175

32 Cronbach Coefficient Alpha with Deleted Item ... 176

33 Pearson Correlation Coefficients ... 177

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In 1996 Hillary Clinton wrote *It Takes a Village*, a book suggesting that parents have many people and institutions to help them in guiding and caring for their children. I believe the same phenomenon is in existence for people who write their dissertations. For this reason, I wish to take this time to thank my own *village* of caregivers and encouragers. Each person has, knowing or unknowingly, helped me along my long, sometimes arduous and sometimes exciting, climb to the top of my own personal Mt. Everest. Although I have listed people under different headings, some shared more than one role.

Major Professors

Thank you, most graciously, Dr. Gerald Hanna, my major professor, who lifted me up from a desperate time in my academic life and filled me with a sense of hope. You are a true mentor. Thank you, Dr. Michael Dannells, my first major professor, for gingerly reminding me that writing in a research style is NOT like producing a creative writing assignment. With your help, my flowery verbiage gave way to deliberate, concise, and to-the-point wordings.

Other Committee Members

Thank you, Dr. Gerald Bailey, for your heart-felt encouragement of both Dave and me as we struggled to maintain sanity in our two-dissertations-at-the-same-time relationship.

Thank you, Dr. Stephen Benton, for your attention and encouragement after a long, long summer of disillusionment.

Thank you, Dr. Chuck Werring, for your example in all that I desire to be in a college professor. Your style and pedagogy are exemplary.

Mentors Along the Way

Thank you, Phil Anderson, Director of the Honor System and everyday cheerleader in my attempts to help the Honor System become all it can be. Only you have knowledge of the depth of my hope for the Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System.

Thank you, Dr. Mitchell Strauss, for lighting the fire in me within five minutes of our first meeting. I am carrying on your dream for this campus as I continue to work with the Honor System.

Colleagues

Thank you, Leanna Stork, for appointments in the Statistics Consultation Lab. Your patience and professionalism speaks well for your supervisor and department.

Thank you, Michelle, Chris, Scott, and Elverta, my colleagues and classmates. You do K-State proud in each of your campus capacities and I wish you well in your own academic endeavors.

Friends-Far and Near

Thank you, my East and West coast life-time friends, Marilyn and Margo. Your emails from the heart are still with me.

Thank you to Star, Janet, and Alice from Hutchinson Community College who planted that first seed of encouragement, even as I "abandoned" you to move away and start my new journey.

Thank you, Irene, my best friend and doctoral colleague in graduate school. We've come a long way, baby!

Thank you, Nova and Laura and Cindy, my very own Honor System Office support group.

Thank you, Bernice, my wonderful masseuse whose Wednesday afternoon sessions took me far away from the tension of thinking and writing.

Family

Thank you, Arthur Marcoux--my Dad, for modeling for me a strong work ethic and self-discipline. Thanks also for the graduation gown; wearing it will always remind me of you.

Thank you, Raymonde Lamoureux Marcoux, my Mom, for your unconditional heart love which sustained me through good times and bad. Thanks for giving me your passionate love of life and compassion for fellow human beings. That love and caring is passed on to those with whom I work every day.

Thank you, my brothers and sisters and your families-- Robert, Daniel, Marcel, Francois (deceased, but my shoulder angel), David, Renee, Jacqueline, Monique--for the phone calls, the encouragement, your belief in me--always.

Thank you, all my children--Trey, Kelli, Cheri and Donnie, and Candy--for putting up with the long haul.

A very special thank you to all my grandchildren--Matthew, Kenneth, Sadie, Gabby, Sam, Nataleigh, Alexis, Tyler, and Jazzmyn--for giving up precious times together so Memere could finish the "20th grade." Memere will make it up to you, I promise!

There would never be an adequate way to say thank you to my hammock swaying, stargazing partner, my soul mate, my husband--Dave. Thanks for standing by me in the for-better-or-worse dissertation days of our lives. It's a good thing we weren't both down on the same days! Your turn comes next December 2002. Without you, the experience would have never happened! I love you and always will!

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to the faculty at Kansas State University. It is dedicated with pride to the men and women who, in their everyday lives, interest, excite, challenge, and celebrate students. Thank you to all who took part in this endeavor. I could not have come to know about your role in addressing student academic dishonesty at K-State without your taking time to answer survey questions and enter into conversations with me, both in focus group format and individual interviews. I also want to thank faculty who gave me permission, after the fact, to sit in on their first-day class sessions.

Having been an instructor of psychology, I am aware of and appreciate the countless hours that go into the preparation of materials for lectures. I also appreciate the faculty-student relationships built along the career journey. If you do not already know or feel it, you are influencial to the students you teach. You impact their thoughts and in turn influence their behavior. Your students do pay attention, if not always to your lectures, then certainly to your attitude and your overall message. You have a responsibility to model, and in some cases verbalize, your values about academic integrity. Do not take that responsibility lightly; you may never know in which student you will facilitate moral judgment.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Academic integrity is critical to the very fabric of higher education, where the quest for truth is manifested in research and learning. Yet, recent studies conducted on the incidence of academic dishonesty in collegiate settings and on the perceptions held by students, administrators, and faculty are disheartening (Aaron & Georgia, 1994; Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; Jendrek, 1992; Kibler, 1998; McCabe & Drinan, 1999; Pratt & McLaughlin, 1989). Between 40-70% of the student body on American college and university campuses admit to engaging in academically dishonest activities in some form (Jendrek, 1992; McCabe & Bowers, 1994; Pavela, 1993; Sierles, Kushner, & Krause, 1988). However, faculty consensus is limited on what forms of behavior constitute dishonesty (Fass, 1998). Traditional forms of academic dishonesty where there is consensus, such as looking on another student's paper during a test or handing in work done by a classmate, have changed with technological advances (Hafner, 2001). High-powered computer programs and applications, Internet access to diverse and instant information, distance learning classes, and handheld computing devices which can beam information in a wireless fashion are new to campus settings within the last decade (Bushweller, 1999; Carnevale, 1999; McMurtry, Kim, 2001; Pownell & Bailey, 2001). Faculty may have an awareness of rapidly changing technology and the implications for student temptation, but what those changes will mean in terms of addressing academic dishonesty is yet to be determined.

Rudolph (1962/1990), in defining the colonial roots of higher education in America, discussed the practice whereby college students were given instruction in moral thought in a senior course taught by the president of some colleges. Final year students debated man's reasoning in relation to acts performed with honorable intentions and for the betterment of the human race. Faculty in the mid 1700's was not averse to expounding on the tenets of moral philosophy, a discipline they believed students needed in order to engage in good behavior both in the classroom and in life. When the university movement, whose grounding came from German colleges instead of English or French, gained popularity in America, the popular belief in educating students in moral matters declined. Faculty, for the most part, no longer considered this duty to be their domain. If faculty in present day and of like mind do not presently engage in the practice of talking about honest scholarly behavior, in nature a moral instruction, the time to start talking may be drawing near. Speaking with students about integrity is not a topic faculty have encountered in training seminars or campus orientations, likely due to the mindset that this is not a faculty role (Davis, 1993; Rodabaugh, R. C., & Kravitx, D. A., 1994). Much of the current knowledge base involving college and university cheating concerns issues such as (a) which students cheat, (b) when students cheat, and (c) why cheating occurs (Allen, Fuller, & Luckett, 1998; Clifford, 1996; Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; Genereaux & McLeod, 1995; McCabe, 1993). Studies involving faculty are critical to understanding the perceptions and communication practices of a campus population so much involved with those students.

Although it is important to understand what types of faculty practices take place concerning the handling of dishonesty issues, it is equally important to understand if faculty members realize the contributing nature of their interaction to student moral judgment development. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) provided definitive research literature concerning student development in the college years, particularly moral judgment development. When faculty members have conversations with college students about values, morals, and challenges to accept personal responsibilities for ethical behavior, they learn to think critically when making moral decisions. Although conversations about values and morals normally take place with peers, it is evident from the research that faculty contribute to this growth as well. Likewise, Chickering and Reisser (1993) confirmed that the college environment helps students develop integrity, one of seven vectors or developmental personal tasks. Students, during years spent in college, begin to humanize values learned in the family of origin. Students also start to personalize these values, retaining some learned earlier and replacing other values with new ones learned away from home. Maturation occurs when students develop congruence between their stated values and expressed behavior.

When students develop integrity, they also develop in moral judgment. Kohlberg (1958/1994) believed the potential for moral development is inherent. However, interaction with one's peers and society serves as a catalyst for its growth. Development in moral judgment requires exposure to persons using higher stages in the critical thinking process. When faculty of higher-level reasoning interact with less experienced students, it may be that this interaction creates enough tension and disequilibria to cause students to process experiences in a different light. Gilligan (1981), in expanding Kohlberg's theory, studied changes in college students' thinking as they talked about and solved real life dilemmas. Faculty and student discussions about what are appropriate and inappropriate in academic matters sometimes result from real dilemmas. Faculty members provide much needed interaction for student development in a variety of areas, but most significantly with students' principled moral reasoning (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). When faculty not only model positive ethical behavior, but dialogue about integrity as it relates to being a scholar, students learn the value placed on honesty in academia. The authors maintain that, "[c]onsistent evidence...suggests a relationship between student-faculty contact and attitude and value change" and faculty may not be aware that their interactions with students correlate with this developmental change (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, pp. 312-313).

Principled moral reasoning has its foundation in ethical theory. Corey, Corey, and Callanan (1998) suggested that ethics, "represent aspirational goals, or the maximum or ideal standards" defined by an institution or profession (p. 4). Aspirational goals and ideal standards are not easy to enforce. Colleges and universities declare aspirational goals such as developing students in citizenship and integrity. Kansas State University's (K-State, KSU) mission statement, found in the 1999 Undergraduate Catalog states, "Kansas State University prepares its students to be informed, productive, and responsible citizens who participate actively in advancing cultural, educational, economic, scientific, and sociopolitical undertakings" (p. 4). For students to become responsible citizens, they should develop in personal integrity. In contrast to aspirational ethics are laws and ethical codes that are minimal standards enforced by educational, political and professional institutions. Colleges and universities design policies addressing academic dishonesty and these rules and policies specify academic behaviors that are judged as wrong. Ethics, rooted in moral philosophy, encompass more than a description of life as one lives it: ethics addresses how one should or ought to conduct oneself in relation to others. Ethics, in relation to academic dishonesty at KSU, means

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that both students and faculty have an obligation to conduct themselves in such a way as to promote honesty in the classroom. A more in-depth discussion follows in the review of literature found in Chapter 2.

Purpose of the Study

Historically, studies on academic dishonesty have used belief and attitude surveys as data gathering tools for understanding cheating. As noted above, surveys have investigated academic dishonesty as it relates to students. Few surveys have been conducted on the role faculty play in communicating information about or addressing violations of academic honesty. Although some surveys have been conducted on faculty (Jendrek, 1989; Kibler, 1994; McCabe, 1993), an in-depth literature review located no surveys using a qualitative data-gathering component useful in addressing issues related to the role of faculty. Faculty and students both comprise the academic community that struggles with the issue of cheating. Therefore, there was importance in conducting research on the role faculty played in relation to the cheating phenomenon at the university level, specifically faculty practices in addressing academic dishonesty with their students. There was greater importance in conducting research on whether faculty members use a student development perspective when addressing academic misconduct by students.

A survey alone may produce answers to questions asking "how much" or "how many" and open-ended items can add much insight; however, a structured interview provides material for rich and thick descriptions of the phenomenon being studied, the hallmark of qualitative research. Faculty can mark *yes* or *no* on a questionnaire that asks the question, *Have you handled an episode of cheating this semester?* Much more detailed is the answer, *Yes, I have, and this is how I handled it.* The knowledge base about students and cheating is broad; knowledge about the other half of the story—faculty and the role they play in defining what constitutes cheating, disseminating information about dishonesty, and adjudicating violations—is scant. Thus was the purpose of this survey and interview study.

Guiding Questions of the Study

Although researchers of academic dishonesty have concluded their studies with recommendations to faculty concerning classroom cheating (Aaron, 1992; Booth & Hoyer, 1992; Kibler, 1993; Nuss, 1984; Paldy, 1996; Roth & McCabe, 1995), none known have asked faculty the fundamental question, *What is cheating?* I am aware of no serious in-depth study on the definition of the construct, academic dishonesty.

In the present study, a questionnaire was administered to undergraduate teaching faculty at Kansas State University. It used an open-ended question and four scenarios to obtain the perceptions of faculty on what constitutes academically dishonest behavior. I presupposed that whereas faculty answers to the open-ended question would be short and simple, definitions of academic dishonesty would become more complex and opinions would differ dramatically when faculty had to judge scenarios of student misbehavior. It seems that definitions of cheating will continue to plague faculty in the future, especially in view of challenges brought on by fast-paced technological changes (Pownell & Bailey, 2001; Carnevale, 1999). Using survey and interview methods, I garnered insights to the fundamental question of this study—How do KSU participating undergraduate faculty make meaning of the term, academic dishonesty?

Related to the fundamental question asked above are other important supporting questions whose answers documented faculty's role in addressing student misconduct. The survey, along with the qualitative interviews of self-selected respondents and focus group participants, addressed these supporting topics:

(a) What practices do KSU participating undergraduate faculty engage in when disseminating information about cheating?

(b) How do KSU participating undergraduate faculty handle episodes of cheating?

(c) What training or orientation has KSU participating undergraduate faculty had in addressing academic dishonesty?

(d) What perspective does KSU participating undergraduate faculty have concerning student moral development issues in relation to academic dishonesty?

Demographic information provided insights into participating faculty who contributed to all components of the study. Personal respondent characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, tenure and rank status, longevity in the profession, training and orientation about academic dishonesty policy, and personal undergraduate experience were also reported to give added richness of context. The answers to the overarching question on what constitutes academic dishonesty and the supporting questions about practices and opinions enrich our overall understanding of those—the faculty—who are intimately involved in addressing the academic ethics of the students they teach.

Definition of Terms

Academic Dishonesty

Zoll (1996) stated that academic integrity "[s]peaks to the value of independent and honest scholarship in educational endeavors" (p. 11). College and university mission statements often express the pursuit of truth as the foundational value on which they operate. However, Fass (1986) believed that academic honesty is often "...expressed only in unwritten codes of ethics" (p. 32). Therein lies one of the problems colleges and universities experience with academic *dis*honesty.

Academic dishonesty, also known as cheating, is more complex and difficult to define. Although it might be argued that academic dishonesty is the absence of academic integrity, Fass (1986) pointed out "attempts to define academic dishonesty are often couched in terms such as 'taking unfair advantage of other students' or 'representing the words or ideas of others as one's own'" (p. 33). Some have suggested that the dilemma engendered by this vagueness of definition is at the crux of academic dishonesty (Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, & Pavela, 1988).

Gehring and Pavela (1994), for purposes of addressing judicial affairs administrators, defined academic dishonesty in more legal terms when they said it is

> ...an intentional act of fraud, in which a student seeks to claim credit for the work or works of another without authorization, or uses unauthorized materials or fabricated information in any academic sense. We also consider academic dishonesty to include forgery of academic documents, intentionally impeding or damaging the academic works of others, or assisting other students in acts of dishonesty. (pp. 6-7)

It was essential to understand how undergraduate teaching faculty at Kansas State University defined academically dishonest behavior. Krathwohl (1993) emphasized that constructs, such as academic dishonesty or cheating, are concepts in general, but we are unable to envision them because they do not have "physical referents, that cry out for names" (p. 147). Due to this nature inherent in constructs, the terms academic dishonesty, cheating, and academic integrity elicited different meanings from one faculty member to another. This observation made it critical to come to an understanding of the general meaning that Kansas State University faculty place on these terms. The survey and subsequent qualitative interviews shed much light on the types of behaviors undergraduate faculty associated with academically dishonest students. Having a clearer understanding of the construct, academic dishonesty, helped in assessing how, and if, faculty interact with students about honest scholarly behavior.

Student Moral Judgment Development

Lawrence Kohlberg's (1981) research extended the knowledge base about basic patterns or schemas applied in the cognitive development of morality. He believed that people have a potential to develop morally through levels and stages, given appropriate interaction with those with whom they associate. Chickering and Reisser (1993) hypothesized that students exposed to faculty who are accessible and willing to discuss issues involving ethics develop integrity. Faculty and student interactions concerning integrity, whether formal or informal, can help students develop congruence between students' values and behaviors. When students are academically honest, they have developed moral judgment and their refraining from cheating is congruent with their values—*it is wrong to cheat.*

Faculty perspective of student moral judgment development is defined in this study as faculty verbalization that a student *learned* something from the process of being caught cheating, discussing the episode with the instructor, and being given a sanction or penalty for such behavior. Faculty verbalizations about a student *growing* from the

EST COPY AVAILABL

experience are also defined as perspective of student development, specifically moral student development. Likewise, faculty comments on student behaviors and student comments, as these relate to stages espoused by developmental theorists such as Kohlberg and Gilligan, illustrate faculty perspective of moral judgment development.

Undergraduate Teaching Faculty

This study considered undergraduate teaching faculty as those persons, employed by Kansas State University who (a) were contracted as full time as defined by the university, both tenured and non tenured; (b) taught on the main campus in Manhattan, KS, in any of the four academic semesters between Fall 1999 and Spring 2001 terms; (c) taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students; and (d) held the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. The undergraduate teaching faculty did not include adjunct faculty, part time faculty, graduate teaching assistants, or laboratory research assistants.

Participating Faculty

As defined above, faculty who participated in either (a) the two focus groups, (b) the campus-wide survey, (c) the individual interviews conducted with volunteer faculty from the survey, a subset of (b), or (d) those observed on the first-day of class sessions at the beginning of the four semesters. All faculty members who were a part of this study are also defined as participating faculty.

Faculty Perspective, Opinions, and Practices

Webster's Universal College Dictionary (1997) defines *perspective* as "one's mental view of facts, ideas, etc., and their interrelationships" (p. 592). Faculty perspective or mental view was defined in this study using two criteria. First, faculty *perspective* of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

student development was defined by the predetermined answers to four survey items on the faculty survey. Whether faculty indicated they *agreed* or *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed* with four declarative statements of opinions determined faculty *perspective* or mental view of the relationship between a student's act of academic dishonesty and that student's moral judgment development. Second, faculty *perspective* was defined by subjective interpretations of qualitative faculty comments made to me concerning student academic misbehavior. The same dictionary defines *opinion* as "a personal view, attitude, or appraisal" (p. 557). Faculty *opinions* were defined in this study as faculty views and attitudes reported on survey item statements concerning student cheating, student moral development, and faculty practices relating to the communication of academic dishonesty. The expressed personal views of faculty in focus groups and interviews are also defined as opinions in this study. Webster defines *practices* to mean "habitual or customary course of action" (p. 621). Faculty *practices* were defined in this study as faculty courses of action specific to communication with students, both verbal and written, in the context of expectations about cheating, dissemination of information about cheating, and prevention and adjudication of student cheating episodes. In summary, faculty opinions and practices about the dissemination of information about cheating and faculty perspective about student development in relation to academic dishonesty are defined within the contexts of this quantitative study involving qualitative components.

Significance of the Study

A thorough review of the literature located no holistic and systematic study of the role of faculty in addressing academic dishonesty. Neither is there adequate research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

literature concerning the practices higher education faculty members use in talking with students about ethical behavior, specifically cheating. The qualitative interviews conducted with the survey's self-selected KSU undergraduate faculty will add to the sparse body of knowledge on faculty experiences and practices with academic ethics, and that will be significant in and of itself.

Second, the findings of this study may benefit those new to the university teaching profession. For many novices to the college classroom, little in the way of orientation or training is available in addressing academic integrity issues. Some members of the faculty learn how to dialogue with students about ethical behavior only after a cheating episode has occurred. Some faculty acquire techniques through watching colleagues struggle with resolving student misconduct such as plagiarism or test copying. Inexperienced faculty may benefit in hearing comments and stories from other professionals, giving concrete examples in what to say to students and how to prevent academic misconduct.

Third, this study may benefit students who desire to know what faculty really think, feel, and do about cheating. Pratt and McLaughlin (1989) concluded, "professors' beliefs, as perceived by students, have an indirect effect on students' behavior" (p. 214). Johnston (1996), in speaking to students who had cheated in a class entitled Moral Development and Education, confirmed this belief when she "explained [her] feelings of anger and hurt because [she] had trusted" her students to be ethical (p. 160). Students who read these shared experiences may gain the courage to talk with faculty about their own cheating beliefs and myths. Students may gain insight into how faculty respond, both professionally and emotionally, to those who have chosen to be academically dishonest. This may help students realize the responsibility faculty has, not only in addressing dishonesty in the classroom, but in influencing student moral judgment development.

On a broader level, the general public may benefit from such a study. In a time when higher education is coming under fire for accountability, this study may attest to the fact that there are members of the faculty who communicate values about academic integrity and take action when unacceptable behavior occurs in the classroom.

Setting

Kansas State University

Kansas State University, specifically the Manhattan campus, was established in the 1860's heyday of land grant college construction (Kansas State University Fact Book 2000-2001). It is contained today on 668 acres on the north side of a midsize midwestern city in northeast Kansas. KSU is one of six Kansas Board of Regents universities and claims 60 departments in nine colleges. For the purposes of this study, survey and interview participants came from only seven of the nine K-State colleges, all including undergraduate programs on the Manhattan campus. The College of Veterinary Medicine (graduate only) and the College of Technology and Aviation (Salina-based) were not included. Remaining colleges included in the study are the colleges of Agriculture, Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Engineering, and Human Ecology. Based on fall 1999 figures, KSU is Carnegie classified as a Research II institution and has a total undergraduate student population of 17, 903. Total full-time faculty population in the same semester reached 1,214, from both the tenured and untenured ranks.

Historical Context

A cheating scandal in the Biology department at KSU brought national attention to the campus in the fall 1994 school term. (Primetime Live, November 3, 1994) There ensued a concerted effort by students, faculty, and administration to address the issue of academic dishonesty. A task force on academic integrity was appointed by the Provost to change existing policy. The Chair of the task force, having received his baccalaureate degree from an Honor Code institution, was instrumental in persuading others that such an integrity system was feasible at K-State. For four years, a small cadre of students, faculty, and administrators designed a workable document and addressed both the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate for approval. The proposed Honor System was approved by Student Senate on December 4, 1997 and Faculty Senate on April 14, 1998.

During the 1998 school year, appointees to the Honor Council wrote and approved the Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System Constitution and By-Laws. Strategies and procedures for educating students and faculty about the Honor System were also written at this time. Honor Council members also designed protocols for fact-finding (later called investigations) and hearing panel sessions. Finally, Kansas State University implemented the Undergraduate Honor System in the fall semester of 1999.

When undergraduate students enroll and register for classes at Kansas State University they tacitly agree to be bound by the following Honor Pledge: "On my honor as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this academic work." Although the Honor Pledge is implied, some faculty require students to sign it on all academic work and examinations handed in. Any instructor or student, having witnessed a violation of the above Pledge, are encouraged to take steps in reporting the violation to the Honor System Director. If the reporter is an instructor and he or she determines not to take independent action on the violation, the Honor System Director then initiates a series of interventions, beginning with an investigation of the violation. Assigned case investigators listen and document (a) beliefs and actions of the reporter of the violation, (b) beliefs and actions of the alleged violator(s), and (c) beliefs and actions of any witnesses to the violation. They report their findings to the Director. The Director then deems whether a hearing panel is convened to determine guilt and sanction of the violation. A body of six Honor Council members convene, including a non-voting Chair as either student or faculty. The rest of the panel is comprised of two faculty and three student members. After hearing testimony from reporter, alleged violator(s), and any witnesses, the panel determines (a) whether a violation of the Pledge occurred, and, if so, (b) sanctions for the violator. The typical sanction is an XF on a violator's transcript, an F in the course in which the violation occurred with a delineation of X meaning dishonesty. The X may be removed at a future date if the violator successfully completes an academic integrity course given for credit.

The Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System is, at this writing, in the third year of implementation. This study sought to discover the role of undergraduate faculty in addressing academic dishonesty on this campus during the time frame of the first two years of operation. A participating undergraduate teaching faculty qualified for the survey study if she or he (a) was a full time faculty member at Kansas State University's main campus, and (b) had taught at least two sections of primarily (over

50%) undergraduate students in any of the four academic semesters—fall 1999, spring 2000, fall 2000, or spring 2001.

Limitations of the Study

This study is based on a frame of convenience, consisting of the population of one large university. Only Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty contributed to this study, therefore the voice of faculty at smaller public or private colleges and universities was not considered. The same issues of academic dishonesty might be addressed differently in those settings. Since graduate teaching assistants were not included in the study, research considering this particular college population may result in different conclusions about the total campus climate concerning cheating. A unique limitation comes from the fact that Kansas State University implemented an Honor System in the first year of the study, resulting in changed policies and intensified campus dialogue. The change in culture and policy at K-State might have led to different findings had the university not been in the midst of implementing such policy change. Although seen as a limitation in this light, one might suggest this study to be beneficial for faculty and administrators interested in designing or modifying current academic integrity policies at universities of equivalent size. One final limitation concerns the qualitative aspect of the study; researcher biases and presuppositions can also affect the outcome of a study. Had another researcher interviewed the same faculty and analyzed the transcribed tapes, different conclusions might result. Greater detail about this researcher's bias will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter discusses theoretical literature in ethics and moral judgment development and sets the background for more specific literature on academic dishonesty. A presentation of ethics theory is followed by a discussion of theories in moral judgment development and decision making, specifically as affected by the college environment. This presentation sets the stage for literature on the lack of integrity on college campuses. The chapter culminates with academic dishonesty issues and trends in higher education. The review of literature links student development in moral judgment and decision making to the influence of faculty on such development, especially as it relates to dishonesty in academia.

Ethical Theory

Ethical theory helps to frame the way students make decisions about academic dishonesty and how faculty play a role in that ethical equation. Historically, there have been multiple approaches in addressing the nature of moral behavior (Rachels, 1998). From the Greek philosophical pronouncements of Aristotle on virtues, to Kant's declared search for a universal principle, to the modern ethical era of relationships and community espoused by feminist writers, ethical theorists have attempted to make meaning of how and why humans conduct their morals lives.

Principle Ethics

Deontologists, or duty ethicists, propose that moral decisions should be based on something other than the consequences of actions (Fieser, 2001). Actions are right and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

good and our duty, if actions are based on standards of a higher power or deity. Two types of deontological theories are found in deontological systems, act and rule. Act theory holds that decisions on right action are individualistic. Morally mature decisions about right action are made on a case-by-case basis, with emphasis on feelings. Decisions about right action are based on affect or emotion, not as much on rational thought. Immanuel Kant espoused rule theory whereby decisions are based on rules, policies, and guiding principles. Actions are not judged on resulting consequences, but by adherence to a rule or principle already delineated as universally good. Kant's Categorical Imperative maintains that moral questions can be answered by looking rationalistically at principles involved in any case. As an example, if the principle "do not lie" is at the heart of the moral question, the rule is followed. Those who do not vary from the rule are absolutists, whereas relativists see conflicting rules or principles and consider which rule or principle to obey.

Casuistic Ethics

The primary premise in a casuistic, or consequentialistic, ethical system is that moral behaviors are judged by the consequences of those behaviors (Lampkin & Gibson, 1999). Consequentialists believe behavior should be in the good interest of others. Casuistry describes right behavior using two theories—ethical egoism and utilitarianism. Three examples of personal statements differentiate ethical egoism: "Everyone should behave for my benefit." (individual); "I should behave in my own self-interest, but the behavior of others is not my business." (personal); and, "I should behave in the same manner as any other person should act in self-interest." (universal). Utilitarianism, under the same teleological umbrella, is divided into act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Advocates of act utilitarianism stress assessing an ethical dilemma to determine which act or decision tips the scale for the greatest good. Proponents of rule utilitarianism dictate that a set of rules, if followed, will bring about the greatest good to the greatest number.

Virtue Ethics

Proponents of an ethic of virtues maintain that personal traits or character make a person act "good" (Rachels, 1998). Virtues such as courage, generosity, honesty, and loyalty are traits and qualities that people have that help them live successful lives. Virtues, as described by Aristotle, are means on a continuum between deficits and overabundance of qualities. An example of this view using honesty is as follows: One end of the continuum states that a person must never lie. The other end of the continuum states that a person must tell the truth unless there are extenuating circumstances where the truth would be detrimental, such as telling a Nazi officer that Jews are being housed in a building. Rachels purports that honesty, as a virtue, character, or trait, is needed because "without it relations between people would go wrong in myriad ways" (p. 675).

Rachels points out that the role one plays in society determines which qualities and how much of each a person should possess to be successful in his or her role. Countering that premise, the author suggests that there may be virtues or traits that *all* persons should possess, that even though we lead different lives, we have many things in common and some virtues are universally good for all of humankind. In the final analysis, Rachels declares that virtues are needed, not because they are divinely handed down, but because we live in communities that require courage, generosity, honesty, and loyalty for successful living.

In conclusion, Rachels argues that the discipline of ethics needs BOTH the theory of laws for right living (Kant's Categorical Imperative) and the theory of virtue (Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics), where character and traits are valued. Having either theory in isolation explaining ethics is incomplete. Rather than saying an action is *morally wrong*, the author suggests that an action be termed as *deceitful* or *ungenerous*. Then, the focus is on successful community life and why it is important to have qualities and traits that lead to it.

Relational Ethics

Feminist literature in postmodern literature attempts to redefine moral theory (Held, 1998). Feminist writers purport that there should be a fresh look at the place that emotions have alongside rationality in formulating moral theory. Fundamental tenets in moral theory—justice and fairness—are based on a paternalistic context, that of the "public" place which is traditionally the domain of males as creators of government and law. Current theorists such as Carol Gilligan, Nel Noddings, and Rita Manning lament the nonexistent role women's development played in ethical and moral development theories. They suggest a context lacking in care and maternalistic views, traditionally the domain of females. Feminists are recreating images of what it means to have an identity of self, critical in moral identity development. Relational ethics hold that concepts such as being responsible to and for others, as well as self, and being "in community" ought to be represented as well as concepts such as justice and fairness.

In summary, ethical theory frames the way students make decisions about academic dishonesty. Ethical theory also frames how faculty play a role in addressing the academic dishonesty of students. Over the centuries, multiple approaches have been used

EST COPY AVAILABL

in addressing the nature of moral behavior. Such approaches have attempted to make meaning of several factors in attaining the *moral* life: (a) how and why humans conduct their morals lives, (b) how they morally decide on what is good and bad behavior, and (c) how they develop moral judgment.

Moral Judgment Development

Lawrence Kohlberg

One of the most prolific researchers in the area of moral judgment development was Lawrence Kohlberg. The point of introduction for Kohlberg's seminal research was his 1958 dissertation studies in moral development (Kohlberg, 1987). Kohlberg was influenced by classic theorists and belief systems such as: Kant's formal theory in moral philosophy; Socrates and his method of educating youth; Baldwin's claims that mental development occurred as movement from dualistic reasoning; Piaget's formal theory in cognitive psychology; Durkeim's claims about respect for community; Mead's work with the *introjection* of the attitudes of others; and Dewey's belief that theory should enhance practice in education. Kohlberg's primary objective was to carry through Jean Piaget's own theory of childhood moral development to the moral development of adolescents. Using this specific population, Kohlberg wanted to extend the knowledge base about basic patterns or schemas applied in cognitive development of morality.

Psychological researchers from Kohlberg's era followed two different perspectives in answering the question, "How do people choose to behave in a moral way?" One was explained as a genetic programming—something inherent in individuals, a psychological trait; the other espoused a learning model where behavior is rewarded by reinforcers or imitated (Kohlberg, 1981). Kohlberg believed that moral development followed neither of these paths and argued that people have a potential to develop morally through levels and stages, given appropriate interaction with those with whom they associate.

In his dissertation, Kohlberg (1958/1994) tested his hypotheses using a sample of 10 to 16 year-old males from different institutions in an urban Midwestern city. His study was qualitative in nature in that he used interviews and card sorts. A set of twenty-five aspects were gleaned from the responses to questions in a series of moral dilemma scenarios. There emerged a clear pattern that became the basis of Kohlberg's theory of moral development.

Kohlberg elaborated on a typological scheme labeling and describing three major levels, each divided into two types. In the premoral level, the person is oriented to external happenings and consequences, without a sense of self having rights. A person at the generalized conformity level begins to understand the self as part of a contract with society. The autonomous level is attained when an individual moves beyond contract with society and uses moral judgment more in line with his or her own conscience, even if that judgment defies the laws set by society. The types in each sequence reflect a continuum with a range in personal sense of obligation or duty—from an egoist to a social orientation. As Kohlberg progressed in his studies of moral development, he changed some of his original nomenclature—type to stage; the levels to preconventional, conventional, and postconventional; postconventional to principled reasoning; moral judgment to moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1976).

A few strong themes emerge from Kohlberg's study. The sequencing of levels and stages is invariant in that people move through them in order from 0 to 5 (later relabeled 1 to 6). Stages and levels of moral reasoning are hierarchical, where the quality of reasoning becomes more robust with each successive stage. Perhaps the most important finding is evidence of the universal component, justice, in the spectrum of responses to moral dilemmas. The sense of "to each his due" is revealed in recurring themes, diverging only in the emphasis placed on which characters are addressed in the dilemmas. In these three areas—sequence, hierarchy, and "voice" of justice—Kohlberg has maintained allegiance from beginning to end (Kohlberg, 1984).

Two hypotheses in Kohlberg's original study were not upheld in later studies and had to be redefined. One was concerned with the belief that individuals did not skip levels or stages, but systematically displayed the thinking patterns of each stage in succession (Kohlberg, 1958/1994, 1976, 1984). Kohlberg (1976) maintained that the "most outstanding inversion of sequence was an apparent shift from a Stage 4 society orientation to a Stage 2 relativistic hedonism in some subjects who became 'liberated' and 'relativized' in their college years" (p. 43). Students revert from an orientation toward the maintenance of societal rules held in high school years, to a rejection of conventional morality, a transitional stage. In later years, Kohlberg also had to concede that, due to lack of empirical evidence, Stage 6 was relegated solely to the theoretical realm (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983).

A methodological change was made in subsequent studies involving scoring. Follow up interviews demonstrated enough variance in sequence movement to change "aspect" scoring to "issues" scoring. What a person valued was addressed instead of the mode of reasoning used by an individual. This allowed the reduction of extraneous content.

Kohlberg also addressed moral development in other cultures. Two longitudinal studies were conducted; one in Turkey with his associates Nisan and Turiel, and the other in an Israeli kibbutz with associates Snarey and Reimer (Kohlberg, 1984). In the first study the hypothesis of sequential stages was confirmed, albeit slower development was found for young males in the country versus young males in town. In the latter study, again, invariant sequencing was observed. It was during this study that Kohlberg was inspired to incorporate the *just community* format in school and prison settings back in the United States. His experience with direct democracy in the Kibbutz setting encouraged him to formulate a school moral atmosphere where both norms of justice and convention gave participants a sense of community (Kohlberg, 1985).

Kohlberg (1967, 1981), through the lens of the moral development perspective, also responded to two landmark Supreme Court cases—*Abington School District v. Schempp*, and *Furman v. Georgia*. The first case focused on the separation of church and state, specifically the restriction of religious instruction in schools. In an eloquent manner, Kohlberg debated that religious and moral education were not the same. He strongly advocated a certain methodology (Socratic discussion) for optimum exposure of children to higher-level moral reasoning; his hypothesis being that individuals develop higher reasoning when challenged. Using the justices' deliberations as examples in the second Supreme Court case, Kohlberg expanded on why reasoning in Stages 5 and 6 was more advanced. More important, he argued why higher-level reasoning was critical in law creating positions.

Kohlberg's theory has had its critics (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983). Sullivan (as cited in Kohlberg, 1984) maintained that Kohlberg's "style of thinking is rooted in

-ST COPY AVAILABL-

certain sociohistorical circumstances" and therefore cannot help but bias thought toward those in other circumstances. (p. 333). This example underscores other critical comments on the theory's normative application to universal use. Gilligan (as cited in Kohlberg, 1984) has challenged that the theory and method are based on all-male studies in personality development, and therefore sex-biased (p. 339). Kohlberg systematically reviewed his dissenter's comments and was faithful in replying with reasoned answers.

Carol Gilligan

Gilligan helped to research the developmental theory she later found lacking in respect to women's reasoning (Gilligan, 1981). Expanding from Kohlberg's theory, she studied how college students' thinking changes when talking about and solving their real dilemmas. Gilligan and Murphy (1979) were fascinated with differences between how students answered questions about their own real dilemmas in relation to the students' answers to Kohlberg's hypothetical questions. Even Kohlberg had questioned the problematic "regression" of students from the high school Stage 4 thinking to Stage 2 thinking in the freshmen and sophomore years of college. Gilligan and Murphy postulated that high school students used idealistic and authority-driven moral reasoning when answering questions in hypothetical scenarios. Later, students' reasoning became relativistic with college life experiences. Hypothesizing this difference in cognitive development as positive, the authors scored the same data with Perry's (1968/1999) scheme and concluded that Perry's system did support the same developmental change in students' thinking patterns. Believing that this change was not regressive in nature, Gilligan became inspired to conduct more research using a naturalistic setting.

Interviewing a sample of women in the throes of thinking and deciding about an abortion, Gilligan and Belenky (1980/1994) discovered that reasoning in actual moral dilemmas was not identical to thinking through hypothetical moral dilemmas. The authors concluded that by "applying a constructivist developmental framework to the analysis of women's thinking about an actual choice" they were then able to determine if, and when, development was occurring in a crisis situation (p. 89). It was the authors' strong impression that naturalistic, longitudinal observations were critical in assessing true development. Persons could say what they *might* do in answering a question about a hypothetical moral dilemma; what they *would* do might be a different story. One way to discern this discrepancy was to question participants over a period of time.

Gilligan (1994) added momentum to the collective concern for the inclusion of women in developmental research. Using the results of a study of women's thinking and deciding about having an abortion, she discovered that the universal justice theme advanced in Kohlberg's study was missing in her interviews with women. Instead, she noted the "voice" of care. Women tend to rephrase a hypothetical dilemma in terms they can then relate to and solve. Whereas men seek the equality of rights in moral judgments, women's reasoning is related to fulfilling personal responsibility in the least harmful way.

Using the same abortion study, Gilligan (1994) designed a framework of women's moral development. Included in the theory are three levels and two transitions in describing how women progress in moral reasoning. The first level incorporates an orientation that is self-centered and motivated by survival. Transitioning occurs when women begin to see the importance of including others' perspectives in making moral decisions. Women reach the second level in moral development when their decision-making is focused on the needs of "others." The second transitional period is evidenced as women begin to recognize their own worth when thinking about options in solving dilemmas. When women give full, honest validation to the perspectives of all persons involved in a moral dilemma, including the "self," the third level of moral development is achieved. Women's movement through the levels and transitions of moral development in Gilligan's theory is similar to men's movement in levels and stages in Kohlberg's theory.

Becoming more convinced that Kohlberg, as well as Piaget, mistakenly generalized a developmental theory portraying male as human and thus normative, Gilligan (1988a) directed her research in highlighting the emergence of another "voice" in moral development. She concluded that boys and girls, in being differentially socialized, manifested differences in psychological tasks—for boys, separating from mothers early on and for girls, remaining attached due to same-sex modeling. In issues of moral reasoning, men think in terms of separateness and independence and women think in terms of relationships and interaction. Gilligan believed that Kohlberg's study was not a fair description of women's development; the solutions scoring used in the measurement instrument consistently represented women less morally developed than men. Women tend to remain stuck at Stage 3 reasoning because their stated solutions to moral dilemmas are expressed in relational terms, not in terms of independence and autonomy (Gilligan, 1988d). Even though Kohlberg attempted to assuage critics by "renaming his test a measure of 'justice reasoning' rather than 'moral maturity,'" Gilligan suggested that the damage had already been done (Gilligan, 1987a, p.22). Too much research had not only been grounded in the original theory; it had used the same flawed measurement instrument. The concept of development had been applied in such a way as to mean increments of "better" development.

Gilligan (1987b) emphasized the existence of two moral orientations—justice and care. Gender-related, rather than gender-specific, these two orientations are embedded in how men and women see the "self," the "other," and the relationship between the two. When answering questions about a moral dilemma, both men and women focus on considerations in each of the orientations. Lyons and Langdale, (as cited in Gilligan, 1987b) devised coding procedures which measured how much of each perspective is used by participants of different gender, age, and type of dilemma—Kohlberg's hypothetical "Heinz" dilemma or the real life "Kathy and Sara" dilemmas depicted in Gilligan's previous abortion study. It was determined that men primarily use the justice focus in moral decisions, whereas most women answer with a care focus. The authors then compared stage and orientation positions postulated in the respective theories of Kohlberg and Gilligan. Individuals, "primarily females (86 percent females, 14 percent males), with care represented in their predominant moral orientation have significantly lower Kohlberg stage scores than individuals, primarily males (69 percent males, 31 percent females) with care unrepresentative of their predominant moral orientation" (Gilligan, 1987b, p. 86). Gilligan argued that to continue using Kohlberg's measurement of moral reasoning was a dubious endeavor.

Reflecting on the results of studies using subjects from a variety of settings (Bardige, Ward, Gilligan, Taylor, & Cohen, 1988; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Gilligan & Pollak, 1988), Gilligan (1988c) determined that a pattern was evident. Both sexes use

EST COPY AVAILABLE

two distinct moral reasoning orientations with a primary focus on one or the other. The author used an interesting analogy for this phenomenon. She likened the experience to the gestalt principle of perceptual organization, where persons automatically focus on some objects in the perceptual field to the exclusion of others (Gilligan, 1987b). What people focus on is called the *figure* and everything else fades as the *ground*. Some persons tend to see the relational or responsible aspects of moral dilemmas; others tend to see the dimension of rights and equality. The above studies revealed that the figure for many women is expressed in the question, "How do I see this dilemma affecting my sense of self and others in terms of attachment and isolation?" For men, the question exists "How do I see this dilemma affecting my sense of self and others in terms of what is right and wrong?" The problem with current moral development ideology, Gilligan claimed, is that women's care focus is not represented in the measures used to identify moral development, and therefore women are seen as deficient, or worse, deviant.

Gilligan shifted her research agenda when she determined that moral development theory was being written solely in justice perspective terms (Gilligan, 1988b). Her focus was now to learn more about the care perspective in girls' and women's moral reasoning. Gilligan progressed from examining voice of care to listening "...to girls whose voices have not informed psychologists' theories in human development...." because she believed "...that their experience was essential for understanding the human world..." (Taylor, J. M., Gilligan C., & Sullivan, A. M., 1995, p.207). As Gilligan became more interested in the development of identity and "self," she started "...listening to women and to girls and bringing their voices into the center of psychological theory and research....In essence, we have been reframing psychology as a practice of relationship by

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

voicing the relationships that are at the heart of psychological inquiry and growth" (Brown & Gilligan, 1992, p.22). Concerned that girls and women be represented in the body of knowledge in psychological development, Gilligan retained a research focus in this area.

James Rest

It may not be often that a person has a serendipitous experience in research, but for James Rest once was enough (Rest, 1979). In the course of an interview with a subject, Rest became frustrated because he had exhausted all probing questions and still had not found a proper stage label. He fantasized turning the scoring manual around and having the subject choose one to his liking. Thus appeared an idea for a new assessment instrument in measuring the development of moral judgment.

Rest, like Gilligan, drew from Kohlberg's and Piaget's moral development work when writing his dissertation (Rest, 1979). He agreed with the basic tenets of their theories, but questioned Kohlberg's simple stage theory, as well as the rigid nature of assessing content over structure. Also challenged was the validity of subjects' understanding of moral choices and preferring higher stages than their own. Rest disagreed that moral development should be assessed as a point; a range better depicted development. With these questions in mind, Rest developed a different tool with which to gather moral judgment information—the Defining Issues Test.

After analyzing the results of a multitude of studies using the DIT, Rest (1986a) developed a framework with which to explain the psychology of morality. Rest and Narvaez (1994) reanalyzed current data and confirmed the belief that each of these processes helps determine moral behavior. Component I is the construct of moral sensitivity—the ability of a person to imagine (or not) all courses of action that can be taken in a dilemma and the consequences of those actions on all involved. Deciding which course of action to take is the task involved in Component II—making moral judgments. Component III incorporates the other values a person uses when deciding what to do in a moral dilemma. Whereas the first three components operate in a person's mind, the last one—Component IV—is the very act of executing or implementing those decisions. Rest and Narvaez (1994) reported on various studies where researchers used the Four Component Model to design instruction. The authors listed several concepts needed for deliberate psychological education: reading academic psychology, actively performing human service work, and a reflective seminar attempting to integrate the academic theory to real-life experience.

Two general trends are evident when DIT studies are analyzed. People tend to move to higher levels of moral reasoning as they grow older, and they use higher-level moral judgment as they engage in formal education. Using meta-analysis to study a cross section of data on over 6,000 participants, Rest (1986a) indicated that age/education accounts for 52 percent of the variance of DIT scores. Rest (1986b) compared adults at a certain age that had only a high school education and found that they had similar DIT scores to students who are currently in high school. Accordingly, adults of the same age with a college education scored similarly to students currently attending college. Rest and Narvaez (1991) concluded that the college experience could provide "general intellectual stimulation that causes students to overhaul and rethink the basic ways they make moral judgments" (p. 239). Of all demographic variables associated with the DIT, formal education is by far the most consistent and powerful variable.

EST COPY AVAILABLE

When examining the effect of moral education on moral judgment in a large number of studies using intervention techniques, Thoma and Rest (1986) found four main types of programs in existence:

(a) Programs emphasizing "dilemma" discussions;

(b) Programs stressing personal psychological development with an experiential component as well as intensive reflection;

(c) Academic programs involved with didactic and literature components; and

(d) Short-term educational interventions of three weeks or less.

General findings verified that moral education programs using the dilemma and personality development components produce moderate, but definite effects. Academic courses do not seem to have an impact on moral judgment development. Having adults in the sample produce larger effect sizes. Intervention seminars of short duration show no impact. What is not surprising is that programs with an element of Kohlbergian theory do relate to effect size. The authors suggested this is contamination rather than true developmental change.

Apart from general information about variables such as age, gender, and formal education, Rest was also interested in what role moral judgment plays in behavior. The ultimate goal in studies of moral judgment development is understanding, even predicting moral behavior. Thoma and Rest (1986) discussed the link between items in the DIT that correlate with the "logical action choice implication" and the subject's DIT score (p.171). They further postulated that the statistical process almost doubled the predictability of behavioral measures on participants' use of justice concepts in making a moral decision, and ultimately acting on that decision.

EST COPY AVAILABLE

In conclusion, a number of moral judgment developmentalists have offered models and theories concerning how people learn to think about right and wrong behavior. Most often quoted is Lawrence Kohlberg, who developed stages and levels in a typological scheme using structured participant interviews. Carol Gilligan began her research agenda with Kohlberg, but eventually determined that too much of his theory was male-based. Using a female population in her research, Gilligan proposed that the ethic of justice espoused by Kohlberg was not appropriate when making conclusions about females; an ethic of care motivated more women in their development of moral reasoning. Finally, James Rest tied moral behavior to moral reasoning development and designed an instrument to help predict moral behavior from moral judgment. Particularly important to this study is the following literature about moral judgment development in the college years.

College Environment

William Perry

William Perry (1968/1999) was interested in discovering how faculty members' multiple and varied forms of knowledge sharing, also known as intellectual and moral relativism, influence college students. He administered an inventory called *A Checklist of Educational Views* (CLEV) to a random sample of 313 freshmen in the fall of 1954 and again in the spring of 1955. Using students' scores on this measurement, Perry then invited 50 students to participate in a study. Students ranged from freshmen with a strong preference for dualistic, right-wrong thinking to freshmen that used more relativistic thinking. Thirty-one students volunteered to participate.

The students were interviewed in late May and June of each of their college years. This research resulted in 98 tape-recorded interviews, 17 of which were complete four-year records. Perry used two open-ended questions in an interview with each of the participants: "Would you like to say what has stood out for you during the year?" and "As you speak of that, do any particular instances come to mind?" (p. 8).

Initially, Perry wanted only to describe the results of this inquiry, but as he continued with his research, he noticed that there were developmental aspects in the quality of the interviews. Intrigued, Perry then obtained a second and larger sample and sent invitations to 50 freshmen from the Class of 1962 and 104 freshmen from the Class of 1964. With this group, Perry did not use measurements on the CLEV. Rather, he drew a random sample of 109 students resulting in 366 interviews, 67 of which were complete four-year reports. Using this sample group Perry set out to describe more fully the developmental sequence he found in students' intellectual, as well as values development.

Using students' reports, Perry theorized that their intellectual and values development progressed in stages or positions, the totality of which is known as the scheme of Positions. Perry maintained that growth occurred, not so much while students are in a Position, but when students are in transition to the next Position in the scheme. In the initial stage of Position 1, Basic Duality, students perceive the world in we-right-good versus they-wrong-bad terms. Authority—those with the right answers or knowledge—is absolute and is gained only through hard work and obedience. Students in Position 2, Multiplicity Prelegitimate, begin to perceive diversity in opinion and uncertainty of absolute truths, but think of this as confusion of poorly qualified authorities. Position 3, Multiplicity Legitimate but Subordinate, students are comfortable with uncertainty and diversity, but attribute these to knowledgeable authority not really knowing the "right" answers. Movement to Position 4, Multiplicity Coordinate and Relativism Subordinate, suggests that students now believe all knowledge and values as legitimate and anyone's authority is right for that person and has merit. This is also known as multiplistic thinking. A major change occurs for students who move into Position 5, Relativism, thinking—relativistic reasoning. Students here begin to see knowledge and values as depending on circumstances, and therefore, relative in nature. Movement to this stage suggests revolution-like change in reasoning capabilities. In Positions 6 through 9, Commitment Foreseen and Evolving Commitments, students start to orient themselves as personally committed to reasoning through situations. Students begin to assume responsibility for having knowledge of context for the decisions or commitments they make. Commitment, in Perry's terms, means "an act, or on-going activity relating a person as agent and chooser to aspects of his life in which he invests his energies, his care, and his identity" (p. 150). Commitment is an affirmation made for choice in one's decisions concerning life. Toward the end Position 9, students become aware that commitment is not only a pattern in making specific decisions, but a way of life—a lifestyle of reasoning.

Perry also suggested that students at any stage might engage in Positions of deflection, alternatives to growth in reasoning. The three Positions of deflection include (a) temporizing, a pause in growth over a full academic year or a lateral growth, a spreading out in one Position for a time; (b) retreating, an entrenchment in the student's attained Position and remaining at that level; and, (c) escape, being done with any

EST COPY AVAILABLE

attempts at moving away from dualistic thinking and commitment. Although sometimes filled with malaise, despair, and guilt, alienation or deflection does not have to be permanent and is sometimes considered growth in itself.

In summary, Perry's research in students' intellectual and ethical development suggests that college students do move through stages in their reasoning. Students grow from using black-and-white dualistic thinking about the world, through multiplistic and relativistic reasoning where knowledge may have multiple origins and degrees of truth, to commitment to reasoning in a more complex manner. Perry's work tells us in academia that the process of growth in students' reasoning may be as important, if not more important, than the content learned in specific disciplines.

Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terrenzini

Pascarella and Terrenzini (1991) compiled, in a reference quickly becoming a classic text in student affairs, the results of hundreds of studies conducted in the field since the 1960's. Their research enlightens an audience whose work is the development of students in higher education. The authors reported on how college changes students in areas such as (a) cognitive development, (b) psychosocial development in identity; (c) self-concept and self-esteem, (c) attitudes and values, (d) career choice, (e) quality of life after college, and (f) moral development. The authors reported "clear and consistent evidence that students make statistically significant gains during college in the use of principled reasoning to judge moral issues" (p. 562). Because many of the studies in the meta-analysis furnished only information about the total gain and did not describe gain from school year to school year, the authors stated they could not justify reporting magnitude of development at that level. Pascarella and Terrenzini maintained that the importance lies not in the magnitude of the gain, but in the fact that students qualitatively change from dualistic or conventional thinking to principled or postconventional thinking.

Arthur Chickering and Linda Reisser

The college experience, indicated Chickering and Reisser (1993), correlates significantly with student maturation in seven vectors, or personal tasks. Developing competence, the first vector, addresses undergraduate student development in abilities in the physical, intellectual, and interpersonal areas of one's life. College students continue to learn how to manage their emotions, the second vector. This is especially true as it concerns self-discipline in the face of new experiences and frustrations. Young adults away from the familiar surroundings of parents and friends continue to master the personal task of balancing autonomy and interdependence—the third vector. The college experience also helps students move toward more mature relationships where mutual consideration begins to replace self-centered behavior. The first four personal tasks in student development contribute mightily to students' abilities in establishing an identity of the total self. Establishing that identity is the fifth vector. Students come to understand better, who they are as persons and what beliefs they choose to hold beyond what they learned in the home. College experiences help students begin to feel more comfortable with their appearances, gender, and general abilities and weaknesses. It is during this time that students also develop a sense of purpose and become intentional about decisions concerning vocation and personal interests. It is in the seventh vector, integrity, that students develop their abilities to be congruent in what they verbalize about values and their behaviors that reflect these verbalizations. In the final vector, students who have failed to master the developmental task of having integrity often are the students who become academically dishonest.

Chickering and Reisser (1993) further hypothesized that students who are exposed to "accessible adults, open enough to be known as real human beings, can have substantial impact, whether they be advisors, custodians, or professors" (p. 269). Faculty and student interactions concerning integrity, whether formal or informal, can help students develop congruence between students' values and behaviors. For students' values and beliefs to undergo developmental changes during the college experience, faculty must take time to dialogue about values and behaviors. When students' egocentric and polar views are replaced with empathy and an ease with ambiguity, they begin to internalize their own set of values. Developing a humanistic view and personalizing a set of values translates into developing integrity. When students develop integrity, they are less apt to be academically dishonest.

Academic Dishonesty

Introduction

Bowers (1964) maintained that the very existence of academic dishonesty is detrimental to the primary objectives of institutions of higher learning. He asserted that although other forms of misconduct are detrimental to the collegiate setting, none undermine a place of learning's existence as does lack of academic integrity. Dishonesty is detrimental to the search for truth, which is basic to institutions of higher education. Bowers also emphasized that academic dishonesty harms three populations—students who do not rightfully gain the education they need, students who do their work legitimately, and faculty who are frustrated at having to distinguish between the two.

Trying to understand this serious breach of academic conduct has led to inquiry into (a) its description and definition; (b) prevalence; (c) characteristics of violators; (d) why and under what circumstances it occurs; and, (e) what to do about it. Most relevant research has been conducted on student perceptions and behaviors, mainly using survey or self-reporting methods. Research on faculty attitudes and practices regarding student integrity is scant and mostly quantitative in nature. The in-depth literature review of academic dishonesty research that follows justified the need to conduct this particular study using methods that bring also richness to description and analysis.

Description and Definition

Moffatt (1990) conducted a survey on 232 students at Rutger University to examine the phenomenon of undergraduate academic dishonesty. He provided a list of 11 forms of cheating where students marked how often each behavior occurred. The author used phrases such as "copied off someone in an exam without prior arrangement," "used a cheat sheet" in an exam," "had someone else take an in-class exam for you," to define cheating practices (p. 4).

McCabe and Trevino (1996) surveyed students at nine medium to large state universities on the influences of personal and situational contexts associated with cheating. The questionnaire measuring the variable of academic dishonesty listed 12 types of self-reported behaviors such as "using crib notes on a test," "using unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given," "fabricating or falsifying a bibliography," and "collaborating on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work" (p. 386).

ST COPY AVAILABLE

Allen, Fuller, and Luckett (1998) surveyed 1,063 students enrolled in an undergraduate marketing course at a large Southeastern university about effects of perceived and admitted cheating practices. The four part questionnaire used sentences such as "A student obtains information from someone who has taken the same exam in an earlier section; the instructor requires all exam takers to sign a vow of silence." "A student alters answers on a test returned for review and then gets credit for the 'mistake.'" as defining cheating behaviors (p. 43).

Although short phrases and sentences as those in the above examples are common in the campus lexicon, it is not at all uncommon for college students; definitions of academic dishonesty may not have the same meaning for faculty.

Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty

Bowers (1964), in a landmark research study of academic dishonesty on American college campuses, was the first researcher to examine the prevalence or frequency of cheating self-reported by students. The Bowers survey project involved 5,000 students on 99 campuses of all sizes and descriptions. He confirmed that incidences of cheating were significant and grossly underestimated by institutions themselves. Forty percent of freshmen survey respondents self-reported engaging in one or more types of cheating behaviors. Percentages for sophomores, juniors, and seniors were 49%, 54%, and 53% respectively.

Sierles, Kushner, and Krause (1988), surveyed 143 at a midwestern medical school that had just developed an honor code. At the start of a spring trimester, students agreed to participate in an experiment whereby those in physiology and neuroscience classes were proctored during tests and behavior science students were not proctored during tests. The questionnaire had demographic information as well as questions about cheating behavior in college and medical school. With confidentiality guaranteed, student data revealed a staggering 86.2 percent self-reported academic misconduct.

A report filed by a Massachusetts Institute of Technology Colloquium Committee (Lipson & McGavern, 1993) on undergraduate academic dishonesty at MIT suggested that of 891 surveyed students, 83% engaged in some form of homework problem set cheating, at least once in the 1991-92 academic term. Seventy-six percent had been involved in some form of *serious cheating*. Serious cheating was defined as a behavior committed by over 50% of students. Seventy-one percent had participated in handing in work not of their own authorship, such as plagiarism. Eleven percent had engaged in one of the four types of exam cheating at least once. The report suggested that the type of dishonesty most frequently committed by students was with homework assignments.

To compare prevalence in cheating over time McCabe and Bowers (1994) surveyed a college population similar to the above-mentioned Bowers's 1964 study on academic dishonesty. The McCabe project involved 6,000 students at 31 campuses. McCabe found that the prevalence of cheating at college campuses was stable. Fifty one percent of students in the McCabe project admitted to engaging in any form of test or examination cheating, whereas 54% of students in the Bowers project admitted the same. This was statistically insignificant, but still considered a high prevalence of cheating.

McCabe (2000) has recently conducted a survey on 21 campuses around the country in which over 2100 students participated. This is part of a larger project being conducted by the Center for Academic Integrity, a consortium of about 200 colleges and universities based at Duke University. Kansas State University was a participant in this study in fall semester 1999, the year the Undergraduate Honor System was implemented. McCabe hypothesized that honor codes influenced the prevalence of cheating on campuses and results of the survey reinforce the hypothesis. Twenty-three percent of students on private campuses with an honor code self-reported test cheating, thirty-three percent on large, public universities with modified codes, and 45% on campuses with no code. Results of self-reporting cheating on written work was 45% of students on private campuses with an honor code, 50% on large universities with a modified code, and 56% on campuses with no code.

Clearly, the prevalence of academic misconduct, as self-reported by students, is evident on campuses nationwide. If 50% is a conservative number of students self-reporting academically dishonest behavior, institutions of higher learning need to address this serious issue.

Characteristics of Violators

Studies on self-reported cheating behavior often report characteristics of those who violate integrity policies. The following studies used surveys to indicate frequency and percentage information on demographic categories such as gender, major, classification, Greek affiliation, and the like. Some studies also sought correlations of student cheating to extracurricular activity and size of college or university.

Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, and Clark (1986) administered a 49-item questionnaire to 380 university students to examine student cheating on exams, quizzes, and homework assignments. Demographic information was compared to elicit the makeup of cheaters and non-cheaters. The authors indicated that most of those who cheat tend to be unmarried and younger than their peers. They are most likely to be involved in extracurricular activities and struggle academically. Higher numbers of those who cheat were also involved in Greek life and depended on parents for financial support.

Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) administered a 21-item survey to more than 6,000 students at large and medium state schools and large and small private schools. The purpose of the questionnaire was to learn about the prevalence, causes, techniques, deterrent measures, and sanctions of academic dishonesty. Data suggests that males self-report more cheating than females. Students at smaller, private liberal arts schools self-report less cheating than students at larger public institutions.

Eisenberger and Shank (1985) used the Survey of Work Values (SWV) to investigate the affect on cheating of work ethic, individual general interest, and satisfaction in performing tasks industriously. Students with a high work ethic are least likely to cheat, due to beliefs that high effort results in achievement. Conversely, students with a low work ethic and a belief that luck is more involved in achievement than effort, may be more likely to cheat

Genereux and McLeod (1995) surveyed 365 college students (49 percent males, 51 percent females) attending Mount Royal College, an urban community college in western Canada. Four versions of a questionnaire were administered randomly to 15 classes of students over a two-week period. The authors found three significant predictors of cheating—males more than females cheat, as do students with lower expectations of grade point averages, and students with beliefs that a higher percentage of students cheat regularly on exams.

Rittman (1996) collected data on a selection of honors and non-honors students at a small midwestern state college. A questionnaire was administered to students in two general studies classes and the results suggested that honor students in college are less apt to cheat than peers not enrolled in honors programs.

Hendershott, Drinan, and Cross (1999) surveyed 532 undergraduate students at a mid-sized, comprehensive, private university about the academic integrity climate. There are gender differences in college students' motivation to cheat, as well as differences in gender and refraining behavior. This study confirms earlier reports from the Bowers (1964) and McCabe and Bowers (1994) studies about male and female self-reported cheating, where 59% of the women in Bower's project versus 70% of the women in the McCabe project self-reported cheating. Sixty-nine percent of males in the first study self-reported cheating versus 70% in the latter study.

In summary, younger and unmarried students are more likely to commit dishonest acts in the classroom. Historically, males cheat more than females and for different reasons. Students who engage in extracurricular activities and affiliate with Greek systems have a higher tendency to be academically dishonest. Students who have lower grade point average expectations are more likely to cheat, as are students who receive financial aid from parents.

Circumstances Related to Academic Dishonesty

Why and under what circumstances does academic dishonesty occur? Michaels and Miethe (1989) viewed academic dishonesty in terms of deviance. They stressed that, in theory, sanctions reduce the inclination to cheat due to the penalty involved, whereas the social aspects of cheating are an entirely different type of motivation. Cheating is associated with other forms of behavior that occur in relation to gains (e.g., higher grades) versus the probability and risk of being punished, many times evident in criminal and deviant behavior.

Historically, the majority of the research on cheating is based on several factors that correlate with the behavior, not on psychosocial theory. Perceived need for high grades and achievement are two reasons students report for committing academically dishonest acts. Barr (1987) argued that students have perceived pressures from peers not to act with integrity. Bowers (1964) determined that pressures perceived by students affected their decisions concerning getting bad grades on their own merit versus obtaining unauthorized aid to boost their grades. Ludeman (1988) attributed an increase in self-reported academic dishonesty to students' belief that achieving high grades is a higher value than doing one's own work. Keller (1976) maintained that students feel the need to compete and be honest in academic work; however, they sense the struggle to do and be both as overwhelming. Barnett and Dalton (1981) associated student stress with the tendency to relax attitudes about cheating, to feel justified about their misconduct. Similarly, Clifford (1996) discovered that students wish to make good grades, but the pressures of the workload make cheating more tempting. Cheating, then, becomes a coping mechanism students use in environments they perceive to be stressful, whether the pressure comes from the need to get high grades or the need to be successful.

Another reason for cheating offered by some students is that testing environments are conducive to cheating. Barnett and Dalton (1981) found that there is a considerable difference in what faculty and students perceive the structure and supervision of test environments to be. In some honor systems, the responsibility for academic integrity rests with students rather than with faculty. Paldy (1996) suggested that implementing an honor system enables students to become more responsible in their decisions about cheating. The system forces students to think about other students in a different light with regard to being honest in academic work. The sense of pride some students feel helps reinforce values of remaining honest even in difficult situations.

Another finding reinforced in studies on academic dishonesty is that students' perception of their peers' cheating behavior influences students' own acts of academic dishonesty. Bowers (1964) explained that if students believe their peers disapprove of cheating, they are more likely not to cheat themselves. However, if students perceive other students condone acts of dishonesty, they are more apt to engage in the behavior themselves. Likewise, McCabe and Trevino (1993) found that students' perception of their peers' cheating behavior is a significant determinant of academic dishonesty. Paul (1998) hypothesized that peer groups influence students' decisions to cheat because students "systematically confuse their sense of what is morally right with their self-interest, personal desires, or what is commonly believed in their peer group or community" (p. 32). If students believe their friends cheat, they themselves engage in copying test answers and allowing other students to copy answers.

Strategies for Controlling Academic Dishonesty

What should be done to lessen incidence of academic dishonesty? Bowers (1964) pointed out that students should have extensive responsibility, not only in owning academic dishonesty through enforcement, but also in adjudication. Davis and Ludvigson (1995) maintained that manipulation of rewards and punishments for cheating "[and] encouraging relevant rule learning, or even better, encouraging a world view, life theory, or philosophy that naturally resists cheating..." helps students with internal control of cheating behavior (p. 120). In a report on strategies to promote integrity (Mulligan, Friedman, Halle, Wogan, & Widnall, 1992), the committee members of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology postulated the importance of faculty raising the consciousness of integrity in academic affairs. They called for more discussion between faculty and students on ethical behavior. Dalton (1985) concluded that colleges and universities must educate students in values and character. Some have suggested a return to honor codes (McCabe, 1993; Pavela & McCabe, 1993; Sierles, Kushner, & Krause, 1988; Tankersley, 1997; Vines, 1996). Booth and Hoyer (1992) developed an ethical decision making framework to help faculty in times when they are facing unethical behavior by students. Recent publications endorse and elicit literature concerning academic integrity.

Strategies also need to be developed for creating an environment where academic dishonesty is discouraged. Bowers (1964) concluded that there are various circumstances that invite cheating behavior. These include the type of course (an introductory course as opposed to an advanced course), the pedagogical techniques used (large lecture as opposed to seminar-based) and whether the course required outside reading along with the textbook. Cole and McCabe (1996) noted that faculty need practical advice and tips in preventative measures to be taken against cheating. Hall (1996) pointed to the importance of including a syllabus integrity statement in new faculty handbooks. He also suggested that faculty invite an atmosphere of academic integrity by regularly discussing assignment requirements and testing procedures. He also noted that faculty have a special need to address questions about collaboration, a learning technique advocated in public elementary and secondary grades in recent years. Cole and McCabe (1996) also

EST COPY AVAILABLE

contended that cheating due to collaborative efforts is one of the few academically dishonest behaviors on the rise; rates for the more traditional cheating behaviors such as copying off test answers and plagiarism are staying steady. Because there is a trend in lower level educational programs toward this type of student assignment, that of collaboration, it is imperative that faculty be clear in their instructions about assignments.

Due to the prevalence of academic dishonesty, there is a strong need for faculty and student interaction. Faculty need practical information on how important it is to address integrity, either in classroom discussion or as printed statements in syllabi (Aaron, 1992). Holcomb (1992) suggested that addressing academic integrity is the responsibility of student affairs personnel as well as faculty. When Roig and Ballew (1992) administered two attitude scales to college students and professors, one based on "typical" faculty opinions and the other based on "typical" student opinions, they concluded that students' perceptions of professors' attitudes towards cheating were similar to faculty's own perceptions of faculty attitudes toward cheating. Another finding was that students self-reported behaving more ethically if they perceived this was important to their instructors. Frequent communication of faculty beliefs about academic integrity may be critical for students. Lipson and McGavern (1993) conducted three intensive surveys about academic dishonesty at MIT and found that faculty communication patterns should be identified when defining techniques to address dishonesty. Roth and McCabe (1995) suggested that the most important concern for faculty should be a system to assure that students understand what is expected of them when it comes to academically ethical behavior.

Summary

In summary, most of the literature on academic dishonesty addresses student thoughts, opinions, and behavior. Much needed at this time is research on faculty attitudes, opinions, and practices as they relate to student cheating. Studies are needed concerning if and how faculty members communicate to their students their expectations about honest scholarly behavior. Likewise, research is needed to learn more about faculty perspective concerning the student development aspect of their practices. This includes studying the impact faculty has on students' moral judgment reasoning when dialoguing about honest academic work. The reporting of faculty perspective, attitudes, and practices has been a missing piece in the student-cheating puzzle, yet a vital piece if we are to understand the phenomenon well enough to change the culture that accompanies academic dishonesty.

Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction and Overview

The preceding chapter's review of literature is testament to the fact that more research is needed concerning the role faculty play in addressing academic dishonesty at the university level. The purpose of this study was to reduce a gap in the knowledge base about faculty opinions and practices in disseminating information about academic dishonesty and dealing with unethical student behavior. More important, this study noted whether faculty members held a student development perspective as they addressed this behavior. This chapter discusses the research design used in this study and clarifies, in the qualitative component, the researcher's biases and presuppositions. A detailed account of the instrumentation used in the study follows. Data analysis techniques and analysis software are described in an effort to set the stage for discussing the findings of the study.

Research Design

Comparisons and descriptive models between two major, and opposing, research epistemologies—quantitative and qualitative inquiry—have been offered by a number of authors (Krathwohl, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Seidman, 1998). The two approaches are similar in that they add to the body of knowledge and truth. A research question drives the design and the methods of data collection. In both approaches rigor is stressed. Both use protocols to carry out investigations thereby maintaining a chain of evidence throughout the study. Integrity and audience appropriateness are also concerns in quantitative and qualitative research.

Differences between the two epistemological inquiries occur in type of research question, goals, methods used, procedures in analysis, and description of quality (Krahwohl, 1993). Quantitative researchers begin the guiding questions of a study with words such as *how many, what, who,* and *how much,* observing entities to measure or quantify. The goal is often to validate a phenomenological explanation or cause; the methods used may include a treatment in a laboratory setting. Analysis occurs with instrumentation and statistical formulas. Qualitative researchers begin by asking questions using words such as *how* and *why*. The goal of most naturalistic inquiry is exploration and description for explanation; the methods are as varied as individual and grouped interviews, overt and covert observations, and document analysis. Analysis is carried out by coding memos and transcripts of interaction for interpretation of themes and patterns. Users of quantitative methods believe a study has merit if it has internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Qualitative researchers use terms such as credibility or truth value, transferability, dependability, and confirmability in describing the effectiveness of their studies (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These are collectively known as trustworthiness. Both approaches in inquiry—quantitative and qualitative—to "the systematic study of societal and individual problems..." are valid (Krathwohl, 1993, p. 8).

Lofland and Lofland (1995) advised students of qualitative research to, "[start] where you are," (p. 11). Researchers who are interested in naturalistic discovery within a nearby and naturalistic setting tend to gain access and stay committed in more meaningful ways than outsiders. I am passionate about academic integrity in general, but specifically as it relates to the impact faculty have on students' moral judgment development under that broad umbrella. The opportunity to work with students and

EST COPY AVAILABLE

faculty through KSU's Honor System has allowed me access to data that may not have been available to an outsider. More important, my proximity to the social setting has allowed a psychological, as well as physical closeness.

Combining quantitative and qualitative methods in a research project is seen by some as a fusion of best methods (Bryman, 1988; Krathwohl, 1998). At times, a researcher is not aware in the planning stages of the advantages of the uses and strategies of a combined methodology; only later come pleasantly surprising results. Two studies cited by Bryman include parental involvement in a federal education program (Smith & Robbins, 1982) and successful innovation in American schools (Huberman & Crandall, 1982). Both studies used a questionnaire survey of their respective samples, and then incorporated qualitative methods such as observations and interviews. The ultimate logic for using both traditions of inquiry is triangulation, a process by which researchers gather data from multiple sources hoping to come to the same conclusions upon analysis. Triangulating information, especially in a single site such as K-State, adds to the research's validity and trustworthiness if the data are broadly consistent.

Researcher's Biases or Presuppositions

For the qualitative components of this study, it is important to address the researcher's biases and presuppositions because the researcher becomes the instrument or tool in data generation and therefore brings the "self" into the designing and reporting of the study (Creswell, 1998). Researcher talents and personality influence decisions made for the type of research design used in a study. Researcher values and biases need to be reported to allow the audience or persons reading the narrative a better understanding of conclusions the researcher has drawn from the study. When the researcher is the instrument in data generation, as in qualitative studies, mention must be made of how researcher traits and beliefs might influence the study.

I am, by nature, curious about people and enjoy interactions with those around me. I am interested in knowing from individuals, through conversations, their own thoughts and feelings about what they do. My training as a counselor enhanced my ability to use questions that drew out candid remarks from those with whom I spoke. More important, my comfortableness with periods of silence allowed interviewees and focus group participants the freedom to speak at length without intrusive interruption. I knew I could gather information in survey form, and I used this medium. However, as Ciccantell (1997) defined the goals of qualitative research to be to "describe, understand, and explain social life," I wanted a more in-depth, rich, and thick description of how faculty members address lapses of academic integrity at this campus. To obtain this richness I chose to use the qualitative approach for some components of the study.

My interpretation of the data gathered in this study may be influenced by the fact that I am female and I have been a teacher and counselor for over 25 years. This educational experience has included times in which I myself have taken the role of faculty in addressing episodes of academic dishonesty in the classroom. At both the public school and college level, my experiences have molded my own thoughts of and practices in the areas of communication, prevention, and adjudication of cheating. Being knowledgeable in the field of student development has biased my belief that most students continue to develop in moral judgment during their college years. For three years while a doctoral student at KSU, I have helped with the implementation of K-State's Undergraduate Honor System, in both its administrative and educational operations. All of the above life experiences contribute to my biases and presuppositions in my interpretation of faculty's role in addressing academic dishonesty.

In summary, I believe in the wedded benefits in using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Both methods have contributed to a rich description and understanding of KSU undergraduate teaching faculty opinions, perceptions, and practices in dealing with unethical student behavior. Both methods have, as well, contributed to a deeper understanding of the perspective faculty have of student moral judgment development. The rest of this chapter will describe in detail each component of the study with supporting descriptions of the methods, the rationale used in choosing each component, the participants, the various components, and the procedures used.

Components of the Study

The Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Survey

Description

A researcher-constructed questionnaire was used in this study to gather information on the guiding questions concerning Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty (Appendix A). Specifically, the information addressed concerned faculty's (a) definition of academic dishonesty, both in words and scenario interpretation; (b) general awareness of the Undergraduate Honor System and opinions about disseminating information on academic dishonesty; (c) practices in disseminating information on academic dishonesty; (d) practices in addressing cheating incidents in relation to type of violation, size of class, and sanctions administered; 5) opinions about student moral judgment development using declarative statements; and 6) descriptive and demographic information. The questionnaire also offered participating and self-selecting

EST COPY AVAILABLE

undergraduate teaching faculty the opportunity to contact the researcher to relate any personal incidents of how he or she has handled a cheating episode. The qualitative component of the survey included the written comments made by faculty on the questionnaire itself, as well as the individual interviews conducted with faculty who agreed to relate episodes of how they handled dishonest student behavior.

Rationale

Surveys allow researchers to gather an amazing amount of information from a large number of respondents in a short period of time. Dillman (2000) related that using a self-administered survey is lower in cost and less time consuming than using an individual interview. All of these reasons contributed to the decision to use the survey method in this study. To interview over 800 faculty members would have been prohibitive in both time and funds. Sending questionnaires in campus mail and using emails for follow up procedures also made a campus-wide survey more feasible.

Participants

After constructing the questionnaire and in the summer before preparing for the pilot study focus groups, I visited with personnel in the University Office of Planning and Analysis and requested a frame listing all full time, undergraduate teaching faculty on the Manhattan campus of KSU. I was told that the Office could generate a list of full time faculty, but could not generate a list exclusively of faculty who taught undergraduate students. I was provided with a Kansas State University Fact Book, 2000, prepared by the Office of Planning and Analysis, as well as a K-State Campus Connection Phone Book with E-Mail listings, 98-99. I then requested from the Office of the Provost, a listing of faculty new to the University in fall semester 2000. The rationale for obtaining this list was that faculty new to campus in the fall could conceivably be considered as qualified to participate in the campus-wide survey in the spring semester 2001.

Using the Fact Book and the Campus Phone Book, I compiled a database of 860 faculty names that did not have an administrator title. I then double checked the Kansas State University home page on the World Wide Web and doubled checked all information in the K-State *white pages*, updating information when appropriate. I also consulted the back section of the Undergraduate catalog where information is furnished on faculty. The constructed database included both first and last names, rank, campus mailing addresses, campus phone numbers, and email addresses of the 860 faculty members. To my knowledge, there was no way to separate graduate faculty from undergraduate faculty. Some faculty members teach both undergraduate and graduate students. I then sorted this database by department and made a listing of all faculty by department (and consequently by college). This listing constituted the frame from which select focus group members were chosen, as well as the total group to whom the questionnaires were sent.

The fact that KSU does not extend the Honor System policy to graduate students is significant to this study. Obtaining a frame for the survey and interviews used in this study was difficult because not all faculty teach undergraduates and those who do may only teach one section. Added to that dilemma is the fact that not all faculty who teach undergraduate students are full time faculty. The statements at the beginning of the questionnaire and the focus group screener both addressed the qualifier: *Are you a full time faculty member at Kansas State University's main campus?* The focus group screener included the qualifier: *Did you teach at least two sections of predominantly*

EST COPY AVAILABLE

undergraduate students? The survey included the qualifier: *Have you taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students in any of the last four academic semesters (Fall 1999, Spring 2000, Fall 2000, Spring 2001)?*

Return rates for the survey will be reported in Chapter 4, Analysis of Data and Findings. The participant matrix summarizes the rank, gender, and college characteristics of participating faculty (Appendix B).

Procedures

Although pilot testing and pre-survey evaluation procedures are detailed in sections below, this section describes the procedures used in survey implementation itself. Before the final edition of the revised survey was delivered to K-State faculty, a departmental listing was constructed using the project database mentioned previously. Individual faculty email addresses were copied from the departmental listing and pasted into 59 separate group email addresses in my Eudora email program. For ease in management and application, these 59 departmental email groupings were maintained for the duration of the survey follow up sessions.

On March 26, 2001, participating department faculty were sent an initial email announcing that a questionnaire would be delivered through campus mail within the week. (Appendix C). Three days later, on March 29, 2001 all questionnaires were sent through campus mailings. Each packet contained the survey instrument with attached cover sheet and a self-addressed return envelope for faculty convenience. A second email was sent to 59 department groupings on April 5, 2001 (Appendix D). Faculty were thanked for their participation and encouraged to complete the questionnaire if they had not done so already. Faculty members were also offered another copy or the opportunity to answer the questions over the phone. Return rates by college were listed on the email with encouragement to those who did not qualify to return the survey instrument in the enclosed envelope. On April 15, 2001, a third email was sent to the total sample (Appendix E). After thanking the respondents and again giving a return rate by college, I offered to read the questionnaire over the phone and reported on the qualitative component of the study. In a final attempt to raise the return rate, a fourth email was sent to targeted departments whose return rates were lower than 25 percent (Appendix F).

As survey instruments were returned, I wrote the date on the top sheet of the questionnaire, as well as a coded number and college. If the top sheet was torn off, I entered the discipline on the top sheet, identifying the college by department listed in the Kansas State University Fact Book, 2000. I set May 30, 2001, as the cutoff date for returned survey instruments, assuming faculty would no longer be on campus on contract time. I entered data in an Excel spreadsheet as surveys were returned, making the information ready for calculations on frequencies and percentages.

Pilot Testing with Focus Groups

Description

In fall semester 2000, two focus groups of undergraduate teaching faculty were used to evaluate and refine the questionnaire. The first focus group participants were given the questionnaire at the beginning of the focus group session, right after introductions. Faculty members were timed as they completed the questionnaire. A conversation ensued about the form and content of the questionnaire and comments for improving the instrument were made. Strategies for improving return rates were also discussed. The second focus group used a longer introduction period and was given the

EST COPY AVAILABLE

questionnaire midway through the focus group session. Comments about form, content, and return rate strategies were also encouraged with this group. The results of the format change will be discussed in Chapter 4. The two focus groups combined offered constructive criticisms and suggested changes that I made in the final edition of the questionnaire.

Rationale

Krueger (1994) referred to focus groups having less than eight participants as mini-focus groups. Participants in these smaller groups engage in interaction on a focused set of topics for the duration of approximately sixty to ninety minutes. In the fall 2000 semester mini-focus groups were used in a survey pilot. The survey pilot allowed KSU undergraduate teaching faculty participants a non-threatening arena in which to express comments about the survey. The mini-focus groups also allowed meaningful conversations about academic dishonesty on campus, a sensitive topic for most faculty. Mini-focus groups were also used to minimize time and scheduling constraints on faculty. Morgan (1997) advocated linking analysis, reporting, and research design of focus groups and suggested the "analysis and reporting are likely to target the specific information needs of the larger project." I not only improved the questionnaire with the mini-focus group technique, I gained valuable insights about the culture and climate concerning academic integrity at K-State.

Participants

The frame of faculty names used in mini-focus group participant selection was the same frame constructed for the survey described in the previous paragraphs. Of the 860 names in the database, five faculty members were chosen for each of the two minigroups. With the exception of the College of Business Administration, each of the seven participating colleges in the study was represented on the mini-focus groups. The participant matrix summarizes the rank characteristics of participants (Appendix B).

Procedures

A telephone contact and screener guide was constructed (Appendix G). The contact and screener guide was used to insure that the faculty fit the two qualifying criteria assigned to the survey portion of the study. A department listing was sorted on the 860 faculty named database. Faculty members were randomly phoned from each of the seven participating colleges. If faculty did not answer on the first call, a message was left on voice mail to contact me within the day of the call. If faculty did not return the call within the day, I made return calls until personal contact was made. When faculty did not consent to being on the focus groups a follow-up question on reasons why were made. Phone calls were made until the ten faculty slots were filled.

Originally, I was going to speak with selected students to triangulate information heard from faculty in focus groups. I later decided, due to constraints in time, not to use student comments in this study. Appendix G contains information about this part of the study and asks for faculty permission to interview students.

Following the initial phone or personal contact of all faculty, an email reminder was sent a day or two before the event. At each focus group, faculty were given an informed consent sheet with information found on Kansas State University's Institutional Review of Research Involving Human Subjects template (Appendix O).

A set of questions known as a question guide was constructed (Appendix I). These questions were formulated in a sequence from general to specific in nature. The explicit purpose of this sequence allows discussion to make a natural movement toward the key issue or content being addressed—how faculty understands academic dishonesty (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). The questions began with comments on the form of the survey instrument and moved to the content being surveyed.

Critical to the mini-focus design is the involvement of a colleague, an assistant moderator. An assistant moderator was used in this study to take complete notes and manage taping equipment, allowing the moderator to focus on the group dynamics and general flow of conversation.

Pre-survey Evaluation

Description

After the second mini-focus group revisions were made, seven KSU undergraduate faculty were sent a copy of the survey instrument through campus mail. An initiating email described the study and forecasted the arrival of the questionnaire in a few days. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire and make comments about the form or content.

Rationale

Fowler (1995) suggested a pre-survey evaluation be performed in a field testing effort to determine appropriateness of questions and understanding of directions by respondents. This step in the survey study allowed one more attempt to refine the survey instrument. Although the author suggested observing respondents actually answering the questions, this time-consuming technique was used on only one pre-survey respondent.

Participants

Seven undergraduate teaching faculty from the database of 860 faculty names were sent copies of the survey instrument. Separate instructions were attached as to how to proceed and where to send the questionnaire back. The participant matrix summarizes the rank characteristics of participating faculty (Appendix B).

Procedures

Names were randomly selected from a sorted listing within the database of 860 KSU undergraduate teaching faculty. The survey instrument was sent to one name from each of the participating colleges. An email describing the study was advanced, along with instructions for a quick turnaround. A self-addressed return envelope was included with the questionnaire for faculty convenience.

Survey Faculty Interviews

Description

An interview is a qualitative research technique involving interaction between a researcher and an interviewee for the purposes of "...obtaining here and now constructions of persons, events, activities, organizations, feelings, motivations, claims, concerns and other entices..." (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 268). Interviews provide researchers insight into the rich and descriptive world of the interviewee. Interviews may be structured or unstructured; the former is used when a researcher understands the topic, whereas the latter is used when the researcher is unaware of what questions are important to ask. In this study, I used structured interviews because I needed answers to the same questions posed to the thirteen faculty members.

Rationale

Seidman (1998) discussed the merits of the qualitative researcher asking herself or himself if "constitutive events in [one's] life...have added up to [one's] being 'interested' in interviewing as a method" (p.7). Upon personal reflection, I felt that there had been enough such events to indicate that interviewing was a wise choice in methods. Counselor training and an inquisitive social personality were researcher assets in engaging faculty in dialogue about a sensitive issue. In qualitative studies, the researcher is the instrument; therefore, the choice to use interviews as a method to gather data was also a statement about my intense interest in people. My well tuned listening and communication skills contributed to an interview atmosphere conducive to gathering rich data from faculty interviewees.

Participants

Participating survey faculty were encouraged to contact the researcher to relate how personal episodes of student cheating were handled. Thirteen undergraduate faculty members were interviewed during the spring 2001 semester, with all seven participating colleges represented. The participant matrix summarizes the rank characteristics of those who volunteered to be interviewed (Appendix B).

Procedures

As Yin (1994) suggested, an interview protocol was constructed (Appendix J). The initial question for all faculty interviews was, "I have been allowing faculty to just start talking about the cheating episode." Faculty were to continue in relating a brief description of the incident and how faculty handled it. A key aspect of the interview guide as mentioned by Lofland and Lofland (1995) is the fact that the guide does not

ST COPY AVAILABL

follow as strict and formal a structure as a survey schedule. Follow-up questions were ready to use if faculty were too brief in their statements. Many of the questions dealt with faculty feelings, thoughts, and opinions about the episode, the student or students involved, and the Honor System procedures. A final question asked of almost all faculty was, *If you had a message you wanted to give students about academic integrity, what would that message be?*

Following initial phone or email contact with a faculty respondent, an appointment was made at the faculty's convenience and contact information was verified. A reminder email was sent the day before the appointment. Faculty were allowed to conduct the interview by telephone, especially when time constraints prevailed. Faculty interviews were conducted in the faculty member's office. Before starting the interview, I gave the interviewee a consent form to read and sign. The consent form contained the information found on Kansas State University's Institutional Review of Research Involving Human Subjects template (Appendix K). Each faculty received a copy of the signed and dated consent form. The interview was taped and lasted anywhere from 20 to 70 minutes. I hand carried a thank you note to each participating faculty member within 48 hours of the interview.

Non-participant Observation

Description

Non-participant observation was used as a data gathering technique throughout the study. I observed faculty in a natural setting, looking for data to help triangulate or cross check other data gathered. In this study, nineteen classroom observations were made to add to the body of knowledge gathered in the two focus groups and the campus-

EST COPY AVAILABL

wide survey. Observations included faculty-student interactions about academic dishonesty, faculty communication about cheating, and faculty practices in preventing scholarly misconduct, all within the context of the classroom.

Rationale

I used non-participant observation, also known as the complete observer position, as a covert technique to refine or verify the data I collected by other methods (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). I later sent faculty consent forms asking that they allow me to incorporate data collected to my study (Appendix M). I did not want to bias the study by asking consent before listening to faculty comments. I used this technique in faculty's classrooms at Kansas State University to triangulate information related by other data gathering methods. Data gathered in the natural setting of the classroom were used to answer the supporting research questions concerning undergraduate faculty practices in information dissemination and academic dishonesty prevention.

Selection of Classrooms to Observe

Logistically, it was impossible to observe every classroom at Kansas State University on the first day of classes; therefore, different sized classes, lecture and interactive classes, and required and elective classes were selected. The course line schedule was consulted to find large classrooms to observe where my presence was difficult to detect when roll was not taken. Permission was asked of faculty to attend smaller classes where my presence was obvious. Faculty in those classes were told that the researcher was a graduate student interested in listening to first day classroom instruction. My intent was to observe as many different types of classrooms as was feasible in the first week of the semester.

ST COPY AVAILABL

An information or contact summary form was constructed to aid in gathering the same types of data in each classroom (Appendix L). Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Along with housekeeping material such as date, time, place, and instructor, other information included approximate number of students in class and discipline and college in which the class was taught. Whether the instructor handed out a syllabus was noted, as was information in the syllabus concerning academic integrity. I also noted whether the KSU Undergraduate Honor System Honor Pledge was mentioned and if the syllabus further explained the new policy and/or the instructor's own policy. Also noted was any verbal mention of academic integrity the first day of class.

Artifacts

Description

Artifacts can take many forms and are vital to the qualitative portion of this study. Examples of artifacts used include the university and college mission statements, university student and faculty handbooks, campus newspaper issues on cheating topics, published university wide policies and website information informing faculty and students of academic integrity. Other artifacts used include course syllabi, class handouts, and memos and correspondence of faculty adjudication of cheating episodes.

Rationale

Yin (1994) argued that artifacts, documentation, are not used primarily for their accuracy or lack of bias; they are used for their ability to corroborate data gathered from other sources. In this study, artifacts were used to answer many of the supporting research questions about faculty communication and practices. Syllabi and other class handouts were used to corroborate self-reported faculty activities. Indirectly, these artifacts were

ST COPY AVAILABL

used to make a statement about how K-State undergraduate teaching faculty define integrity. There is exactness with documentation, but there also is a chance for biased selectivity on my part. Cheating occurs in the context of campus culture; any information within that culture, such as documentation, that enlightens the research topic is valid.

Selection of Artifacts

Artifacts were incorporated in this study dependent on access, availability, logistical circumstances, and ease in documenting. The more artifacts included, the better the triangulation of data. Some artifacts were used to set a background for the culture of academic integrity at Kansas State University. Other artifacts were used to learn about undergraduate faculty practices in the education, prevention, and adjudication of academic dishonesty. In some cases, I used artifacts to help me start a dialogue with faculty about perceptions of content and what faculty believed the artifact meant. The selection of artifacts added to the richness of the information gathered in focus groups, interviews, non-participant observations, and campus-wide survey.

Instrumentation

Questionnaire

Construction

The questionnaire was designed and constructed while I was enrolled in the course, EDCEP 819, Survey Methods, in the 1999 fall semester, eighteen months before its administration. I followed basic survey construction principles noted by Dillman (1978) in the Total Design Method (TDM) suggested to increase participant response. I also consulted a noted reference on improving the design and evaluation of survey questions by Fowler (1995). Following the advice in these references helped me receive

COPY AVAILABLE

respectable response rates, thus making information about Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty a valuable resource on the climate of campus integrity. In the summer prior to the pilot study, I refined the instrument with input from fellow colleagues in the field of student affairs. The questionnaire is found in Appendix A.

Page 1. The survey instrument consists of six pages in two columns with the top page containing critical information required by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The title is written in bold letters with the graphic of a hand holding a quill. The graphic was used to give the questionnaire an image depicting an academic setting. The top sheet of the questionnaire is printed on different colored sheets, with the remaining five pages white. Each color signifies the respective respondent college with the College of Agriculture being purple, the College of Architecture, light yellow; the College of Arts and Sciences, Pink; the College of Business Administration, blue; the College of Education, white; the College of Engineering, green; and, the College of Human Ecology, amber. Color-coding the top pages helped me quickly identify colleges that were responding well, as well as those colleges who needed more follow up as time for returning the questionnaires neared. The top page also gives qualifying information on the left with the average time to complete (7 minutes), as stated by pilot participants, in large and bold print. The rationale for this font and size, in the words of one focus group participant, was to "let 'em know it ain't gonna be a pain in the you-know-what as far as time to complete." The opposite right hand side states the reason for the study and contact information.

Page 2. The second page of the survey instrument, Questions 1-7, begins with information allowing faculty to express opinions that were not too controversial. This, according to Dillman (1978), encourages participants to continue filling out the questionnaire, saving personal questions for the end when participants are more apt to answer sensitive questions. The first qualitative question, in the form of three blank rectangle boxes, appears at the bottom right side of page 2 and asks faculty to write three words or a phrase that comes to mind when seeing the term "academic dishonesty."

Page 3. Page 3 of the survey instrument, Questions 8-12, addresses faculty's classroom practices in disseminating information about academic dishonesty. Instructions at the beginning inform the survey respondent of the time frame used for Parts II and III, as well as what definition to use for cheating (the KSU Undergraduate Honor Pledge). Three questions (8, 10, and 11) on practices have multiple numerals, and ask the respondent to mark all that apply. Question 9 is an open-ended question asking how much time, in approximate minutes for a typical class, faculty spend talking with students about what constitutes academic dishonesty. At the end of the third page faculty are asked their awareness of any cheating incidents that have occurred in their courses during the last four academic semesters, fall 1999 to spring 2001.

Page 4. The left side of page 4, Questions 13, requires respondents who answered yes to the above question to circle all numerals pertaining to types of cheating that occurred. Next to specific examples of behaviors that could be seen as cheating are spaces to mark how many students were enrolled in the class where the offense took place, with ranges delineated as 5-20 students, 21-50 students, and over 50 students. The right side of page 4, Question 14, addresses what types of sanctions faculty used in dealing with the above episodes of misconduct, to which faculty mark all that apply. The remaining questions numbering 15 through 18 are in the form of four declarative

ST COPY AVAILABL

statements to which faculty mark agreement or disagreement. These statements indirectly express faculty perspective and opinions about student moral development and academic dishonesty. The statements were used to learn whether faculty members believe students learn from episodes of being caught in an academically dishonest act and sanctioned or penalized. The presumption is that if faculty believe students learn from these experiences, faculty members then use, albeit indirectly, a student development perspective in addressing these issues.

Page 5. Page 5 begins by asking faculty to add to a qualitative component of the study. Faculty, by calling or emailing the researcher with information about a personal experience in dealing with an academically dishonest student, will add to a richer and more detailed understanding into faculty-student interaction. I make it clear that faculty can call anonymously and just relate the experience; there is no need to identify the person making the call. To insure this anonymity, I offer faculty an example of a phrase to use, "For your research, I can relate a personal episode of how I handled student cheating." Page 5 continues with four scenarios significant to the study's guiding question—what constitutes academic dishonesty? Faculty members are asked to respond whether they consider the students in each scenario to be cheating. Whereas the open-ended answer boxes on page 2 furnish specific words faculty think when they hear the term *academic dishonesty*, the scenarios encourage faculty to interpret certain situations as being dishonest or not. The right hand side of page 5 (Questions 23-26) ask faculty for personally identifying characteristics such as years teaching undergraduate students, disciplines and types of classes faculty teach, and whether or not faculty have received training or orientation in addressing academic dishonesty with students.

Page 6. On the final page of the survey instrument, page 6 (Questions 27-35) more demographic information is sought. Manner of training and orientation given, faculty members' own undergraduate experience, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, and rank are all solicited as characteristics personal to individual undergraduate faculty. I then thank faculty for taking time to complete the questionnaire and furnish information about the major professor and Chair of the IRB.

Analyses

Analysis of Survey Data

Descriptive data were gathered and reported in terms of frequencies and percentages of responses to survey questions. Reported frequencies and percentages are depicted on tables for most, but not all question items. Data included familiarity with Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System, how and when undergraduate teaching faculty disseminate information on cheating, how much time is spent on discussing what constitutes cheating, and whether or not faculty are aware of an Honor Pledge violation occurring during the four semesters of the study. Descriptive data were also gathered on faculty opinions with respect to taking time to discuss academic dishonesty both in class and in talking with a student after he or she has been found cheating. Faculty also gave opinions on whether or not they believed a series of four scenarios were behaviors that constituted student cheating. Demographic data, in frequency and percentages, are reported on types of classes taught, whether faculty had received training or orientation in addressing academic dishonesty, faculty's own baccalaureate experience, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, and rank.

T COPY AVAILABL

Following Spector's (1992) explanation on conducting an item analysis, I used four survey questions to investigate the construct *faculty perception of student development*. The questions included Q-15 through Q-18 (see Appendix A). To determine the internal consistency, or interrelatedness, of these four questions, I submitted raw data to the SAS statistical program and obtained a Cronbach coefficient alpha for the four-item scale and Pearson correlation coefficient among the four survey questions.

Analysis of Qualitative Components

Creswell (1998, pp. 148-149), in a data analysis table, described helpful steps to take in the analysis portion of a study. Each aspect in data analysis aids in the transformation of data, through interpretation, into a valid and credible reporting of the project as a whole. A data analysis table allows a simplistic view of a complex data-gathering process during the course of a qualitative study or investigation.

Using Table 1 on the following page, I report the file management used for this study. In the left-hand column of the table are the tools I used to manage all the qualitative data I collected. Included is a researcher's journal where I documented dates, times, and places of focus groups, individual faculty interviews, survey procedures, observations in the classroom on the first day of each semester, and information on where artifacts were collected. In the right-hand column are listed the corresponding research components in which the data were collected. Other data management tools included the qualitative analysis program, contact sheets from the observations, memos made in all components of the study, and documents to verify data, such as syllabi, copies of Collegian articles, mission statements, and printed Honor System web pages.

Table 1

File Management Used in Study

Qualitative Data Management	Research Components
Researcher's Journal	All Components
QSR NUD*IST* Program	Qualitative Survey Comments
Contact Summary Sheets	Non-participant Observations
Memos	All Components
Documents	Artifacts

Note. QSR NUD*IST Program: QSR = Qualitative Solutions and Research. NUD*IST = Non-numerical Unstructured Data*Indexing Searching and Theorizing.

After creating files, the second data analysis procedure I used is the reading and memoing of text from a) transcribed tapes from focus groups and individual faculty interviews entered in the NUD*IST program (described in detail later), b) transcribed comments from the survey instruments entered in the NUD*IST program, c) transcribed margin notes made on artifacts such as syllabi and faculty and student handbooks, d) web page notes, e) student newspaper articles, and, f) notes taken from contact sheets during observations. Also analyzed were all the notes and memos taken during debriefing sessions with a colleague who helped moderate the focus group sessions.

Classifying is the third step in analyzing data and is a more focused procedure than simply reading or memoing. Classifying entails searching text and graphics for general themes, patterns, categories, and identifying phrases. To make classifying more manageable, Creswell (1998) suggested that a small number of themes be teased from the

ST COPY AVAILABLE

general body of data. These central themes are then used in word and phrase searches where more information can be tagged to describe data in participant's own words.

At the interpretation stage of the study the researcher tries to make sense of the patterns and themes that have evolved from the classification stage. Interpretation can be based on informed hunches of the researcher and is actually a pulling together of themes and patterns to form a wider picture or vista of the study.

The final stage of the study is the reporting stage, where the culmination of data gathering and analyzing is manifested in an informative and illustrative manner. Using these data analysis procedures assures the researcher that the study is organized and managed well from start to the finish.

An application software used frequently for qualitative studies is the Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing (NUD*IST) computer program (mentioned above in Figure 3.1). The program Users Guide (QSR NUD*IST 4 User Guide, 1997) states that the computer application is designed "to aid users in handling Non-numerical and Unstructured Data in qualitative analysis, by supporting processes of coding data in an Index System, Searching text or searching patterns of coding and Theorizing about the data" (p. 2). At the beginning of the project, research material was organized in NUD*IST in two interlocking subsystems, linked by the ability to do searches. One, the Document System, contains information about every document entered into the project, whether it was imported into the application or simply referred to with information about a document in external storage. When coded documents and then their content are explored, another component of the program, the Index System, is built. This characteristic is made up of nodes or containers for thinking about the project as

COPY AVAILABLE

well as categorizing parts of the project's organization. The application features Explorer windows to both subsystems and allowed coding, editing, memoing, and searching documents within. This program, although initially difficult to learn, provided a powerful tool for making sense of the data. The NUD*IST program facilitated the exploration of patterns and themes in the qualitative components of the study.

The final writing focuses on descriptions of Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty perceptions, opinions, and practices used when addressing cheating. This body of information is a rich description about faculty communication as interpreted by me: information about talking about academic dishonesty, preventing cheating, and dealing with cheating when prevention does not work. The interpreted voice of Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty adds to the scant body of knowledge accumulated on faculty in respect to academic dishonesty. Faculty populations, missing in research on the topic of student cheating, are critical to the full understanding of this important and timely topic.

In the final reporting of this rich description of the beliefs, opinions, and practices of participating KSU undergraduate teaching faculty, I used pseudonyms for all direct comments. Although some richness was lost in not using identifying characteristics such as discipline, college, or even specific courses, I felt it crucial to uphold my word to all who participated that their identity would not be directly given or inferable by identifying particulars.

I conducted a member check with 24 of the participants in this study. A member check is a technique used to lend credibility to data collected in interviews, focus groups, and other qualitative research methods. "This approach, writ large in most qualitative studies, involves taking data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions back to the participants so that they can judge the accuracy and credibility of the account" (Creswell, 1998, pp. 202-3). Member checks were conducted with focus group participants, individual interview faculty, and faculty in whose classrooms I conducted observations. When I completed Chapter 4, where participant quotes were used, I sent the chapter in its entirety to each of the 24 faculty members in the qualitative component of the study. When quoted, faculty members' exact words and utterances were included in the member check copy. However, some participants asked that I edit out repeated words and the utterances that did not give the quote ease in reading. Where context and relevance were not compromised I did edit their quotes, but with faculty member permission. Ben Yagoda (2002), in the Chronicle of Higher Education article *Quote, Unquote*, asked the question, "...How far is it permissible or ethical to go in and clean [a quote] for grammar, clarity, or brevity?" (p. B18). I edited faculty quotes, removing unnecessary repetitions and utterances, but the quotes that remained are faithful to intent. In the final revision, I incorporated faculty thoughts and suggestions written on the returned member check documents. In keeping with Yagoda's suggestion to refrain from being a strict constructionist on one end of a continuum or a loose constructionist on the other, I retained the exact quotes that gave meaning and clarity to the study's guiding questions.

Summary

In summary, this study combined a quantitative component and supporting qualitative components. I constructed a survey instrument, revised it using a pilot study of two undergraduate teaching faculty focus group sessions, and refined it using a small sample of like-faculty representing seven KSU participating colleges. The survey instrument, using two questions to qualify full time undergraduate teaching faculty who had taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students in the last four semesters at KSU (fall 1999-spring 2001), was delivered to 860 faculty in spring 2001. Survey respondents were asked to contact the researcher to relate personal situations where they had handled a cheating episode; this became one qualitative component of the study. Other qualitative components included (a) non-participant observations in selected classrooms conducted on the first day of classes each semester during the study; and (b) K-State artifacts such as mission statements, syllabi, student newspaper accounts, and Honor System web site information. With a combined approach to data collection, I was able to triangulate data for a more valid and trustworthy study.

AVAILABLE

Chapter 4

ANALYSES OF DATA AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to conduct research on the role faculty play in respect to the student cheating phenomenon, specifically faculty perceptions, opinions and practices in addressing academic dishonesty with their students. This study also addressed whether participating Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty received training or orientation, and what type, in addressing academic dishonesty issues. Additionally, research was conducted to learn from faculty, through survey items and verbal and written comments, if they operate from a student development perspective when attending to students' cheating episodes.

As mentioned at the end of Chapter 3, pseudonyms were used for the protection of the identity of all faculty members who made direct comments used in this dissertation. Direct quoted material is set in indented, single-spaced format with a bolded first-name pseudonym. Identifying characteristics have been removed with generic information used in brackets.

This chapter opens with a more in-depth reporting and analysis of the episode that led to the implementation of an undergraduate Honor System at Kansas State University. Secondly, demographic data are reported on those undergraduate teaching faculty who participated in the survey, in the self-selected interviews, and as part of the non-participant classroom observations. Next, a section on survey return rate is furnished. Guiding questions of the study are answered with an intermingling of the results of the survey, as well as analyses of the qualitative data gathering components—two focus group sessions, comments written directly on the questionnaires, non-participant classroom observations, and university and classroom artifacts. The combination of components triangulate or cross check data gathered in the survey. In this chapter I relate what I have learned through these various data gathering methods how faculty make meaning of the phenomenon of academic dishonesty at Kansas State University. I focus on faculty beliefs about what constitutes academic dishonesty and what faculty members perceive their role to be in communicating information about it. Beyond perceptions and beliefs, I report on faculty practices, both self-reported and observed. I relate examples of how undergraduate faculty handle episodes of infractions of the policies they set, as well as self-reported detection and prevention of cheating. More important, I use faculty voices to give insight into the perspective faculty have concerning student development, specifically moral judgment in relation to academic dishonesty. Faculty comments suggest they have rudimentary knowledge of the learning that takes place when students are caught cheating and discussions ensue. A final section briefly summarizes the results of the study.

Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System

Definition of a Modified Honor System

The literature defines terms such as integrity system, honor system, and honor code as systems or institutional policies with one or more shared components. Melendez (as cited in Zoll, 1996) stated that most traditional honor codes or integrity systems incorporated the following:

(a) Pledge. A signed statement required from each student that he/she will act or has acted honorably in the preparation of work to be accepted for academic credit.

EST COPY AVAILABLE

(b) Unproctored examinations. A uniform requirement that academic honesty in an exam be enforced only by the voluntary cooperation of each student being examined.

(c) Reportage. An obligation placed upon each student not to tolerate any infraction of honor by another student.

(d) Court. A peer judiciary whose primary concern is the infraction of honor by students (p. 3).

Kansas State University's Undergraduate Honor System incorporates two of these components—the Honor Pledge and the peer judiciary—and is therefore known as a modified honor code system. KSU does not engage in unproctured examinations as defined above; however some instructors do give what are called *take-home* exams and some faculty members do physically leave their classrooms while examinations are being conducted. KSU does not demand or obligate students to report violations of the Honor Pledge, although there is strong encouragement to take some action. Action, defined by the student who witnesses the violation, can take the form of addressing the violator personally or informing the faculty member of the behavior. K-State's Honor Council panel hearings—the adjudicating bodies of the Honor System—do have student majority rule. Lastly, K-State does have an Honor Pledge which states, *On my honor, as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this academic work* (Kansas State University Honor System web site home page). Therefore, KSU's Honor System satisfies the definition of a modified honor code school with majority student representation on hearing panels and with an Honor Pledge that is implied, if not written, on all academic work performed by registered students.

ST COPY AVAILABL

Early History of the KSU Honor System

1994 Principles of Biology 101 Cheating Episode

In the fall 1994 school term, a cheating scandal in the Kansas State University Biology department brought national attention to the campus (Chronicle of Higher Education, November 23, 1994; Primetime Live, November 3, 1994). The episode occurred in a Principles of Biology course, a survey class of 800 students. Dr. Larry Williams, professor and previous coordinator for the course but not during this episode, described the chronology of what occurred (L. Williams, personal communication, June 16, 1999). He had helped the instructor in whose class academic integrity was breeched because of the relative inexperience of the instructor and the magnitude of the situation. Dr. Williams explained that one academically capable student, who was given permission to take the Monday night quizzes early, memorized the letter answers to 20-item multiple choice quizzes and gave the answers to his sister who was struggling in the course. The sister, in turn, broadcast the quiz answers to members living in a Greek house. Some students then passed answers on to others in residence life housing.

The cheating scheme was found out when quiz scores, overall, were rising at an unrealistic rate. In the end, one hundred and fifteen students were involved in the scheme. I queried Dr. Williams about the fact that cheating on a large scale had occurred before this time and why did he think this episode different. He stated, "We hit it hard. The police became involved." According to a student reporter from the *Collegian*, Kansas State University's daily student newspaper, a campus police detective had interviewed 70 students within ten days to determine if illegal behavior had occurred during the cheating (Wright, 1994). Criminal activity such as stealing the test, selling answers, or illegally entering computer programs would have meant misdemeanor or felony charges for the students involved. The investigation resulted in finding no criminal activity.

Dr. Williams's account of the Principles of Biology incident was corroborated when I interviewed the Provost who commented, "...they set up an elaborate mechanism for this episode..."(J. Coffman, personal communication, June 25, 1999)." Instructors involved in coordinating the course decided to alter subsequent quizzes given to the majority of students later in the day, as opposed to giving the same quiz that 25 to 30 students had taken earlier. Questions on the quizzes were still in the same order, but answer options were mixed. Clearly, those students who had memorized a sequence of answers and written them without reading the content of the questions received very low grades compared to weeks of high scores in previous weeks.

Others were interviewed who had been intimately involved with investigating the event. Faculty, administration, and classified staff who were employed by K-State at the time of the cheating episode still become animated years later when discussing the effect this event had on the campus. Three themes stand out from transcribing their words: increased campus interaction as students, faculty, administrators, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the national news media became aware of the incident; the commitment of time from discovering the dishonesty to sanctioning the last student, and differing viewpoints among faculty and students about the event. As evidenced by November letters to the editor of the *Collegian*, blame for cheating is assigned not only to the students, but to the faculty as well. Varied comments were made about those faculty members teaching the large Principles of Biology class, suggesting faculty culpability. These included "The biology department has embarrassed the entire University"

(Thomas. 1994); and "Failure to provide high-quality instructional environments constitutes 'academic dishonesty' on the part of the University and its faculty. " (C. O'Neill. 1994). Other comments alluded to the role of faculty and included "...I would like to remind [the writer to a previous letter to the editor] that the University's faculty consists of academics. not policemen. We are neither the students' parents nor their disciplinarian. nor are we hired to monitor and enforce their behavior" (D. Roufa. 1994); and "...I would suggest that everyone at this University. faculty and students alike. ask themselves what they can do to prevent cheating.... We are all in this thing together" (D. Rintoul. 1994). The Principles of Biology cheating episode began an intense campus dialogue about cheating. personal responsibility. and the need for revised policy.

Before the fall 1994 semester ended. there ensued a concerted effort by students. faculty. and administrators to address the issue of academic dishonesty at K-State. At a university-wide faculty meeting called within three weeks of the episode. over 150 faculty and three students debated the necessity of a task force to recommend changes in policy. When asked the reaction of faculty and students. the Provost recalls:

> **Provost:** They all knew that cheating happened and they had reported cheating through the old policy from time to time. but they were kind of shocked that it was just a big wake up call on how serious the problem could get to be if it didn't have more focused attention.
> **Helene:** Okay. It was a big wake up call for the faculty. Did you find the same kind of thing happening with students?
> **Provost:** Yes. in fact two or three of the student leadership were at that faculty meeting. And at the end of the day. the students were the ones that. really as time went on and the task force got into the second year. the students really took on the major leadership.
> **Helene:** They were pretty much as intense as the faculty?
> **Provost:** Yes. And there was a lot of debate in that meeting about....[S]tudents made the point that it was not totally a student problem. that faculty needed to take some of the responsibility for creating the situations that don't lead to cheating. such as test files being available in the Greek houses but nobody else having them (J. Coffman. personal communication. June 25. 1999)

It would be five years before recommendations from the Provost's Task Force on Academic Honesty culminated in the establishment of the KSU Undergraduate Honor System, unanimously approved by the Honor Council on February 22, 1999, the Kansas State Student Senate on April 1,1999 and the Faculty Senate on April 13, 1999.

Structure and Implementation of the KSU Honor System

Beginnings

The Honor Council met for the first time on October 9, 1998 to develop its mission statement and design a constitution with by-laws. Four committees of faculty and students were established (a) to draft a constitution and by-laws, (b) to develop strategies to educate the campus community about the Honor System and market its importance, (c) to develop protocols for case investigations, and (d) to develop protocols for hearing panels. The Honor Council continued to meet throughout the fall and spring semester to refine Honor System components, while the Honor System office staff prepared procedures to begin handling violations of the Honor Pledge in fall 1999.

Mission Statement

On the Honor System web site homepage, under the terms *Mission and Purpose*, the KSU Undergraduate Honor System mission statement declares it to be, "an organization of students and faculty who seek to preserve the integrity of the Honor Pledge at Kansas State University. It aims to secure justice for any student under suspicion of dishonesty, to vindicate his or her name if innocent, and, if guilty, to protect the honor and standing of the remaining students by imposing the appropriate sanction as set forth in the constitution and by-laws" (Honor System Web Site Homepage).

The Honor Pledge

The KSU Undergraduate Honor System has, as a prominent part of its structure, an Honor Pledge: *On my honor, as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this academic work.* The Pledge is implied and when a student registers at Kansas State University, he or she agrees to abide by this statement, whether or not it is written on assignments and assessments. The Honor Pledge is one of the four components, as defined by Zoll (1996), which identifies KSU's Honor System as a modified honor code.

The Honor Council

With the exception of the College of Veterinary Medicine, which has its own graduate Honor System, the remaining eight colleges all have representation on the Honor Council (HC). Each college has two faculty members and two student member representatives. Due to its size, the College of Arts and Sciences sends three members in each category. These 34 faculty members and students comprise the Honor Council. It is the duty of each member of the Council to investigate cases of misconduct, hear cases brought before panels, and educate the campus community about the Honor System.

Faculty Reporting Procedure

Within the K-State Honor System policies, faculty members are encouraged to handle episodes of academic dishonesty in one of two ways. Faculty members may address violations of the Pledge on their own in the privacy of their offices. If this option is chosen, faculty must insure that students are notified of their chances to appeal to the Honor System Director. By law, due process—the notification of a student of his or her violation and the chance to be heard and/or appeal—must be afforded to students. Due process is guaranteed when faculty furnish the Honor System Director with a report of the incident. A form is available at the Honor System web site and is returned to the Director (Appendix N). The reporting form contains information about the student, the incident, and any sanctions given. Faculty, however, may choose to report the incident directly to the Director, giving the Honor System's Honor Council full responsibility in investigating and adjudicating an alleged Honor Pledge violation. Once the case is placed in the hands of the Honor System, the faculty may only make recommendations for sanctions. The final decision of the Honor Council is binding and autonomous. Appeals to the Honor System Director are heard only in cases where new evidence is forthcoming or there have been procedural irregularities.

Case Procedure

When the Director of the Honor Council receives a report from a faculty member or reporting student that there has been an alleged violation of the Honor Pledge, the Director then appoints both a faculty member and a student member to an investigation team. The case investigators then meet with the reporter of the alleged violation, any witnesses who may be associated with the case, and with the alleged violator. After listening to the specifics of the case, the investigators make a report and include a recommendation on whether the case be heard by a hearing panel. If the latter is deemed necessary, the Director then sets a date for a hearing and students and faculty are then chosen from the Honor Council, with care given to have equity in gender and college affiliation. If the case investigators recommend not going forward with a hearing panel, the Director then informs the reporter of the recommendation and reason why, which is usually the lack of clear evidence. If the case goes forward to a hearing panel, the

ST COPY AVAILABL

Director writes an outline script of the proceedings and furnishes it, along with all evidence and case investigators' report, to each member of the hearing panel. All parties—reporter, alleged violator, and witnesses—have access to the script just before the hearing is convened. At the hearing the reporter, witness, and alleged violator have the chance to state the facts of the case in person. One significant aspect of the hearing panel is that of the six members, three are students and two are faculty, with one member serving as a non-voting Chair whose position alternates between a student and faculty member. Clearly, this sitting body has a student majority of voting members. Student majority on the adjudicating panel is one of the four qualifying descriptors of an Honor Code school, as defined by Zoll (1996).

H.I.P.E.-Believe It!

A group of volunteer students known as Honesty and Integrity Peer Educators (H.I.P.E.—Believe It! or H.I.P.E.) was recently organized to educate K-State students and faculty about the Honor System. H.I.P.E. students not only promote KSU's new integrity policy, they also stress a higher level of communication between faculty and students. Faculty can request H.I.P.E. presentations to their classes, large and small. As part of its intensive campaign to educate faculty, H.I.P.E. members request a new faculty list from the Provost's office and schedule individual faculty appointments to explain Honor System procedures. H.I.P.E.'s responsibility to help students is also manifested in its service as student advisors to alleged violators during hearing panels. On a campus the size of Kansas State University, it is essential that members of the campus community are knowledgeable about Honor System procedures; H.I.P.E. helps to fulfill that important role.

EST COPY AVAILABLE

Case Adjudication

Director of the Honor System Phil Anderson (2000), in the 1999/2000 year end annual review given to the Kansas State University Faculty Senate, noted that there had been 25 alleged violations of the Honor Pledge reported, involving 33 KSU students, with ten and fifteen cases occurring in the fall and spring semesters respectively. In the following year, Anderson (2001) noted in the annual review that 55 cases had been reported, involving 91 students, with 24 and 31 cases occurring in the fall and spring semesters respectively. The Director concluded that the increase in cases over the first two years is probably due to the increased awareness of the Honor System on campus, both among faculty and among students. He also stated that the increase could indicate, "... [a] comfortable[ness] with its adjudication procedures" (p.1).

The XF Sanction

The typical sanction hearing panels gave to students who were found in violation of the Honor Pledge was an XF placed on the student's transcript. The F indicates failure in the course in which the student was enrolled. The X portion indicates failure due to an incident of academic dishonesty. The student then could enroll in and, if successfully passed the Academic Integrity course, could remove the X portion of the XF on the transcript. The Honor Council views the Academic Integrity course as an educational sanction within a student development perspective.

The Academic Integrity Course

As part of the requirements of an internship taken in the Counseling and Educational Psychology curriculum, I designed and developed the Academic Integrity course that sanctioned students must take to remove the X portion on their transcripts. I now instruct the course whose objectives include educating students in the different approaches to ethical dilemmas, as well as helping students develop new ethical decision making skills, not only in academia, but in later professional and personal lives. To date, I have held eight sessions of the course and have initiated a research agenda using these student contact hours to gain insight into the student perspective of academic dishonesty. The course format uses ethics and philosophical readings, discussions on the readings, lecture, and journaling. Students are assessed using a midterm exam, journal writings, a term paper, an interview with faculty who share how they have dealt with academic dishonesty, and a final. Students are also assessed, with their consents, with a pre and posttest using James Rest's Defining Issues Test explained in the review of literature portion of this dissertation. The Academic Integrity course syllabus and assignments are accessible on the Honor System web site home page.

The Honor System Web Site

While physical case files are housed in the Honor System office at 215 Fairchild Hall on the K-State campus, a web site maintained by office staff can be accessed at http://www.ksu.edu/honor. The top portion of the web site's home page is displayed in informational sections on the Honor System, the Honor Council, and the H.I.P.E. organization. Much of the information concerns the mission, history, and organizational workings and proceedings of these three entities. Information such as meeting times, agendas, and minutes of meetings are furnished, allowing members of the HC and H.I.P.E. to keep abreast of committee work, service status, and current cases. Annual Honor System reports are also available.

Below the upper panel is another panel that displays informational links specific to faculty and students needs. Faculty and student reporters of violations of the Honor Pledge can download report forms and submit them through campus mail. Information concerning syllabus inclusion statements and the XF policy, as well as proactive strategies in preventing cheating, may be accessed. In its effort to help faculty become more student development-oriented, the Honor System offers a link to the ten principles of academic honesty, guiding faculty in techniques that encourage student academic honesty. Students may also nominate faculty who they believe are exemplary in following the principles. Links are also provided on the web site to aid students learn about strategies to prevent cheating. Some of these include examples of academic dishonesty, how to avoid situations that lead to cheating, and resources available to students that include tutoring, personal counseling, and test anxiety management. Most of these links are meant to help faculty and students learn better teaching and studying habits.

In the last two columns of the web site, the Honor System addresses current academic integrity research and gives a forum for the campus community to conduct a dialogue about its importance. Current research and academic integrity sites, at both the local and national level, are linked to address faculty and student interest in what is happening on other campuses as well as K-State. Some of these links include the McCabe 1999 fall semester Academic Dishonesty Survey conducted at K-State, other institutional integrity policies across the nation, conference presentations made by Honor System staff, and a complete bibliography on academic integrity. These tools help the campus community in better understanding the Honor System and thus fulfilling part of the Honor Council's mission to educate the K-State community.

The KSU Honor System web site is linked on the web site for the Center of Academic Integrity (CAI). CAI considers Kansas State University as a model school in promoting academic integrity in the campus community and offers other colleges and universities to contact Honor System personnel for information and help in starting their own programs. To date, KSU Honor System staff has had inquiries from the University of San Diego, Western Carolina University, Mississippi State University, Texas A&M University, and Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Summary

Kansas State University is known as a modified Honor System because it has two of four criteria identifying a true honor code school—an Honor Pledge and student majority on its adjudicating hearing panels. The impetus for implementing an Honor System at Kansas State University began with a severe episode of academic dishonesty in the Biology department in fall semester 1994. Due to the magnitude of the number of students involved and eventual national coverage of the incident, a campus-wide dialogue ensued. A task force, appointed by Provost Coffman, studied national policies designed to address academic dishonesty. A focus was placed on honor code institutions and how K-State might benefit from such a system. After unanimous approval by K-State students and faculty, a modified Honor System was implemented in fall semester 1999 and continues to serve as the official academic dishonesty policy. The Honor System itself is comprised of unique components such as an XF sanction, an Academic Integrity course, and a peer educators group that educates the campus community.

Demographics of Study Participants

In this section, I report the demographics and characteristics of the focus group participants, the respondents of the campus-wide survey, the faculty in whose classes I conducted non-participant observations, and the self-selected survey undergraduate teaching staff who granted me interviews. This information is also reported as a matrix in Appendix B. Demographic information furnished on participants throughout the study includes college affiliation, rank, gender, and ethnicity. Survey data information collected is also reported on faculty tenure status, years teaching undergraduates at K-State, and citizenship. Discipline affiliation information was collected but not reported, except in certain areas where I deemed it necessary for interpreting purposes.

As mentioned previously, all references to KSU undergraduate teaching faculty who participated in this study—focus groups, survey, interviews, and non-participant observations—are in the form of pseudonyms. When faculty are quoted directly, fictitious first names are used. This practice, standard in qualitative research discourse, protects the anonymity of faculty who comprised the total study slate.

Focus Group Participants

In fall semester 2000, ten full-time Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty members were asked to participate in two focus groups (Appendix B). The purpose of the focus groups was to have select undergraduate teaching faculty review and comment on a questionnaire about academic dishonesty. This questionnaire was to be conducted with faculty the following spring semester. Gender makeup of faculty who were present in the focus groups was three females and four males. One member was an assistant professor; three were associate professors; and three were full professors in rank. All were Caucasian. Three faculty members were absent on the day their focus group met. Each absent faculty was contacted by phone or email for a follow-up interview to determine his or her thoughts and comments about the survey, as well as their opinions, and practices in relation to academic dishonesty and perspective in relation to student moral development. However, none of the three faculty members was available to participate. The seven faculty members who were able to attend the two focus groups represented six of the seven colleges in the study. A faculty member from the College of Business did not attend; however, a faculty member from that college was given a survey to evaluate before the refined questionnaire was mailed campus-wide.

Survey Participants

An overall synopsis of survey participants is available in matrix form in Appendix B. Seven of nine Kansas State University colleges and a combination of 59 KSU departments were represented by participants who responded to the survey. Participating faculty, as mentioned previously, self-qualified if they were full time Kansas State University faculty who had taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students within four semesters—fall 1999 through spring 2001. These four semesters included the first two years of the implementation of the KSU Undergraduate Honor System. As an aid in reporting returned surveys and noting response rates, each college was identified on the questionnaire by its own colored cover page. Because the cover page contained survey information and not survey questions, some faculty opted to tear off the cover page before returning the questionnaire. All except one faculty member responded to the question asking for discipline, therefore I was able to match discipline with college affiliation. Appendix B also reports each of 59 faculty departments and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

survey faculty representation on several characteristics such as faculty rank, tenure, gender, ethnicity, and citizenship. Almost all respondents reported answers for rank, gender, and citizenship. More than a few faculty members opted not to respond to the questions on tenure and ethnicity.

Table 2 below and continuing on pages 95, reports survey participants by rank, tenure, gender, ethnicity, and citizenship. Just over half of the survey participants came from the ranks of assistant or associate professor; full professor rank was represented by almost 40% of those faculty who returned the questionnaire, with instructor rank participants making up almost 8% of the total return. Tenured and untenured status were represented as almost 70% and 30% respectively. Male respondents outnumbered female respondents by over two to one. Eighty-two percent of participating faculty was Caucasian and slightly over ninety-three percent were of US citizenship.

Table 2

Survey Participant Profile by Rank, Tenure, Gender, Ethnicity, Citizenship

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage in Population
Rank		
Instructor	29	7.9
Assistant Professor	82	22.5
Associate Professor	109	29.9
Professor	145	39.7

(table continues)

Survey Participant Profile by Rank, Tenure, Gender, Ethnicity, Citizenship

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage in Population
Tenure		
Tenured	253	71.7
Non-tenured	100	28.3
Gender		
Female	110	30.0
Male	256	70.0
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	297	82.0
Asian	40	11.0
Mixed	14	3.8
Hispanic	6	1.7
Native American	3	0.8
African American/Black	2	0.6
Citizenship		
US	339	93.4
Other	24	6.6

Note. n = 339 to 365. Percentages are based on denominators of item responses.

One third of the participants self-reported teaching K-State undergraduates 1 to 5 years, while another third self-reported teaching 6 to 15 years. Almost 22% of the participating faculty declared they had been teaching K-State undergraduates 16 to 25 years. Fourteen percent of faculty responding to the survey indicated they had been an educator of K-State undergraduate students for more than 25 years. Combined, the average total number of years participants self-reported instructing undergraduates at Kansas State University was 15.3 years.

Non-participant Observation Faculty

For the purpose of observing faculty communication about academic dishonesty, I consulted the fall 2000 and spring 2001 KSU class line schedules. I chose classes taught by undergraduate teaching faculty listed in the main database I used for the focus groups and spring survey. In these two semesters, I attended ten large classes (over 50 students), four medium classes (21 to 50 students), and two small classes (5-20 students), making a total of sixteen faculty members observed on the first day of their classes. Demographics associated with faculty are on the participant matrix (Appendix B). Ten male and six female undergraduate teaching faculty members were observed in each of the seven KSU colleges participating in the study. Three faculty members were instructors, three assistant professors, four associate professors, and six full professors. All sixteen were Caucasian.

Self-selected Survey Faculty Interview Participants

In the questionnaire administered campus-wide in spring semester 2001, faculty were solicited to contribute to the qualitative portion of the study. Thirteen faculty members responded and granted me a phone or face-to-face interview (Appendix B). Five female and eight male faculty members represented the ranks of three instructors, two assistant professors, five associate professors, and three full professors. All thirteen participants were Caucasian and all seven colleges were represented. Four interviews were conducted on speakerphone and permission was granted to tape the conversation. The rest of the interviews were conducted face-to-face, with seven in the office of the faculty and one in the office of the researcher. All conversations were taped with the exception of one where the faculty member did not want the interview on tape. In this last interview, I relied on notes taken during the interview.

Summary

Appendix B notes the particular composition of each group of study participants—focus groups, survey faculty, interviewed faculty, and observation faculty. Appendix B also reports faculty rank, tenure, gender, ethnicity, and citizenship. A total of seven of the university's nine colleges and 59 disciplines were represented in the survey respondents. The number of faculty members representing University departments are also noted in Appendix B. Classroom observation faculty members were representatives from the same seven colleges as faculty participants in the survey. Although the College of Business was not represented in the focus groups that helped revised the questionnaire instruments, a faculty member from the College of Business did receive, respond, and return the questionnaire with input on form and content.

Response Rates for the Campus-wide Survey

Returned Questionnaires

Qualifying Faculty

Using the database described in the methods chapter, 860 questionnaires were sent to Kansas State University teaching faculty on the main campus in April of the spring 2001 semester. Of 860 questionnaires sent out, 513 faculty returned questionnaires by campus mail for an overall return rate of 59.65%. Of the questionnaires returned, 368 faculty qualified themselves by answering yes to the two questions on the front of the questionnaire: (a) *Are you a full time faculty member at Kansas State University's main campus?* and (b) *Have you taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students in any of the last four academic semesters (Fall 1999, Spring 2000, Fall 2000, and Spring 2001?* These 368 qualifying undergraduate teaching faculty are also referred to as participating faculty in the remainder of the study.

Only one questionnaire could not be matched with college or discipline. The individual response rate for each of the nine colleges was over 50%, with all 59 disciplines having at least one faculty respondent and 56% of the disciplines having over five respondents. Four disciplines—Architecture, Biology, English, and Music—had over 10 faculty members respond.

Summary

Although a perfect frame for the study was unavailable, a useable one was constructed. The number of returned and useable questionnaires, a total of 368 faculty, declared themselves to be full time KSU faculty on the main campus. Each faculty also reported teaching at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students within the time frame given in the instructions—four semesters between fall 1999 and spring 2001.

Addressing the Guiding Questions of the Study

Introduction

The rest of this chapter addresses each of the guiding questions of this study. In the first question, I wanted to know how faculty at Kansas State University defines the term *academic dishonesty*. I was interested in understanding what words or phrases came to mind when faculty heard or saw this phrase. Survey faculty and focus group faculty were given three blank boxes in which to write their responses.

The second question concerned *how* and *when* faculty members disseminated information to their students about academic dishonesty. This inquiry included items on the questionnaire about methods and practices used in the dissemination of information about cheating; however, focus group faculty and interviewed faculty also contributed rich description for this question as well.

The third guiding question determined faculty awareness, opinions, and practices in handing episodes of student academic misconduct. Focus group faculty and individual interview faculty went into more depth with discussions of student reactions, sanctions used, and personal feelings throughout the episode. Focus group and interview faculty also contributed insights into how they detected and prevented academic dishonesty.

The fourth question concerned whether faculty received training and orientation on the topics of academic misconduct and adjudication of such acts. Also noted were types of orientation and training, such as workshops, seminars, handbooks, and departmental and university orientation sessions.

The final question, and perhaps the one most important to the central theme of this study, dealt with faculty *perspective* of students' development, specifically moral judgment development at the collegiate level, especially as it relates to cheating behavior. Using the combination of both qualitative and quantitative research methods resulted in a final reporting of the voice of selected Kansas State University faculty on the critical issue of addressing academic dishonesty.

Question 1: How Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Make Meaning of the Term, Academic Dishonesty?

Some answers to this question were found using two exercises. First, a fill-in-the-blanks exercise gave faculty an opportunity to write in short answers using three words or a phrase. More in-depth answers to the first guiding question were gleaned when I interpreted faculty responses to four scenarios of student academic behavior. In each scenario faculty members were asked if, in their opinion, the scenario depicted student behavior as cheating, a violation of the KSU Honor Pledge.

Three Box Exercise

As an introduction to the topic of academic dishonesty, when I queried survey faculty, I used the phrase, *What three words or phrase come to mind when you hear the words 'academic dishonesty'*. Respondents were asked to write their answers in three boxes included on the bottom of the first page of the faculty questionnaire. Seven faculty participants in two focus groups also filled the boxes on the questionnaires they were tasked to review and revise. This exercise was used to elicit a cursory definition of academic dishonesty from participating Kansas State faculty. I interpreted faculty members' answers to this question as synonymous to what they believe academic dishonesty is using single words, or small phrases.

Words most frequently used. The word most commonly written in the first box was the word *cheat*. Two hundred twenty seven survey participants filled at least one box with a word form of *cheat* such as *cheater*, *cheating*, and *cheats*. One pilot survey respondent wrote the word *cheating* in all three boxes, signifying his apparent emphasis that academic dishonesty equates cheating and nothing more. The word *plagiarism*, in various forms and spellings, ran a very close second place with 180 mentions, and most often was written in the middle box. Where faculty varied most was in the third box or choice of word for academic dishonesty. The word *copying* or forms of the word *copy* ranked third behind the words *cheating* and *plagiarism*. One hundred two respondents used *copy* as one of the words in the three boxes provided. Some wrote what was being copied, such as *copying test answers, copying homework, copying off or using a friend's work, allowing others to copy your work,* and *copyright violators*. Quite a few respondents wrote *copying* in a phrase with the words *test* or *exam*. The word *lazy* in some form, such as *laziness*, was the fourth most frequently used word in describing academic dishonesty. *Slacker*, a slang word, was another written description. One respondent wrote, more to the point, *intellectual laziness*.

Words depicting student behavior. Interesting themes evolved as I analyzed the words in the three boxes. Some single words and phrases depicted student behaviors faculty considered as academically dishonest; others depicted character traits, presumably of students who cheat. Another category of single words and phrases highlighted the perceived consequences of student cheating. In a last category, some single words and phrases used descriptive phrases associated with academic dishonesty. I coded a word or phrase as describing a *behavior* if there was student action involved. Individual examples of words or phrases depicting student behavior were shown in Table 3 on the following page. A particular phrase used by more than one respondent was listed only once.A few words and phrases might be unique to a particular discipline; phrases such as *cooking results* and *ghost writing* and *data fabrication* were noted in the science disciplines.

However, many of the words listed in Table 3 were written by faculty in all seven of the colleges represented in the study.

Table 3

Words or Phrases Depicting Student Behavior

Student Behaviors

---

cheating
plagiarizing
copying
ghost writing
roving eyes
not telling the truth
selling tests
using crib sheets
cooking results
data fabrication
taking the easy route
writing palm notes
helping others cheat
passing exam notes
changing a returned exam
not doing a fair share in group work
not doing work yourself
unauthorized sharing of information
misrepresenting information
using notes on calculator
lie about the reasons for not taking an examination on time
using somebody else's work for benefit of own
using a paper again in another class
working with another person when the activity is supposed to be individual

---

Words depicting character or personality traits. Some single words or phrases fell into the category depicting a person's character or personality traits. Table 4 on the following page notes individual examples of these types of words. If more than one respondent used the same word, that word or phrase was noted only once. As with behavior words listed above, words depicting character or personality were used by faculty members across colleges and disciplines.

Table 4

Words or Phrases Depicting Student Character or Personality Trait

Student Character or Personality Label		
uncaring	unethical	unprofessional
not trustworthy	lack of honor	irresponsible
desperate	lack of self-respect	liar
no principles	foolish	stressed
lack of integrity	disrespect	low achiever
nervous	scum	sneaky
unscrupulous	selfish	

Words depicting consequences of cheating. If words depicted the *result* of cheating behavior. I categorized them as consequences of cheating as indicated by faculty. Table 5 below notes words depicting the consequences of cheating for the student or feelings faculty may experience upon uncovering a cheating episode. one form of consequence to the act of student dishonesty.

Table 5

Words Depicting Consequences of Cheating

Consequencies of Cheating Label			
XF	intolerable	trust or lack of	unfortunate
unacceptable	disappointing	unfair advantage	dismissed in disgrace

(table continues)

Table 5

Words Depicting Consequences of Cheating

Consequencies of Cheating Label			
expulsion	indignation	failure	dishonor
cheaters never win	regrettable	flunk	corruption
expel	cheat and die		

Unique words and phrases. The last category, coded descriptive, describes student academic dishonesty in unique words and phrases. Some words may indicate participants' perceived *causes* of cheating—why cheating occurs in the college setting. I noted in Table 6, on the following page, examples of words or phrases that faculty reported that I thought were unique. Faculty used these words and phrases as they tried to describe what came to their minds upon seeing or hearing the term *academic dishonesty*. Some words refer to the student and some words seem to refer to the environment in which the cheating occurs, whether that be at the university level or the individual classroom.

Table 6

Unique Words and Phrases

Unique Word Label		
waste of my time	difficult to detect	a problem student
lack of ability	headache	struggling student
administrative neglect	conformity	unpermitted collaboration

(table continues)

Table 6

Unique Words and Phrases

Unique Word Label

open enrollment
pain in the neck
shortcut
absenteeism not enforced
lack of strong culture of integrity
unethical students not held accountable

Of 368 faculty survey respondents, 27 (7%) left all three boxes blank. Others used the boxes to give me their own messages, such as *It's a term I never used. Silly, gobbly gook*. Some faculty members wrote their answers using a touch of humor, such as *George W. Bush* and *oxymoron*. The exercise, for a small group, was frustrating in that they found it difficult to reduce a concept such as academic dishonesty into three words or a phrase and stated such. Although it is unrealistic to define a construct in limited fashion such as was used in this exercise, it did show that when asked for single words or a short phrase to describe academic dishonesty, some faculty were in agreement on a few similar words, with *cheating, plagiarizing*, and *copying* in some form as most widely used.

Scenarios of Student Behavior

Scenario I. The first scenario of student behavior presented in the survey (as Item Q-19) develops as follows: *A student is in the Student Union discussing with a close friend an essay taken in History at 8 a.m. Two tables over, overhearing the conversation, is another student who will take the test in another History section at 2 p.m. Would you consider the* ***first talking*** *student to be cheating?*

As shown in Table 7 below, of the 360 respondents, 32 or 8.9%, reported the belief that the student talking about the test in public is acting dishonestly.

Table 7

Q-19 Scenario 1-Talking About a Test After It Has Been Taken

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	32	8.9
No	307	85.3
No response	21	5.8

Note. n = 360.

Almost 85%, (307 faculty), marked *no* and some wrote qualifying comments next to Scenario I on the survey. None of the faculty who marked the behavior as cheating wrote comments on the questionnaire. The following list reports comments of some faculty who answered no, that the behavior was not cheating, but wanted to qualify their answers:

-This is tactless and indiscrete, but not cheating
-No intent or knowledge
-Yes if 1st student knows about other, no otherwise
-If unaware of another student
-Unless asked by instructor not to discuss until the next day
-It is professor's responsibility not to reuse exams
-Can be very situation-dependent. What were the instructor's instructions?
-All of these scenarios would definitely be considered cheating in some contexts and definitely be considered not cheating in other contexts. The instructor's challenge is to help students learn to make judgments about what is appropriate and is not appropriate.
-Unwise, especially if student had been instructed not to talk about exam
-Common tests for multiple sections are not used in that department. If they WERE, however, I'd probably say 'yes' to Q-19.'
-The instructor should take responsibility and change the question.

ST COPY AVAILABL

Faculty in both focus groups answered in similar fashion, with more faculty saying they would not consider this particular student behavior cheating. Another focus group conversation about the same scenario developed as follows:

> **Josh:** I had assumed it was the same exam and I have this thing that any competent instructor, well no instructor's competent that are going to give the same exam twice.
> **Helene:** But that happens.
> **Josh:** In the same day...well, that's not competence. (Laughter).
> **Martha:** (Inaudible...but showing agreement.)
> **Josh:** Like sending a fox to bring home the chickens, but I had to assume that the student was getting a fair warning...about discussing...
> **Helene:** In our former focus groups that topic did come up—had the instructor explicitly, verbally said, you know, 'Do not give any of this information until we meet again.'
> **Martha:** Yeah, it didn't say, so I assumed the instructor hadn't done that. (Laughter at this point.)
> **Josh:** Yeah.
> **Helene:** Now you're raising your eyes and what is that telling me, your behavior?
> **Josh:** Well, what it's telling is...we've got some faculty who don't know one end from the other.
> **Helene:** When it comes to...?
> **Dennis:** (Laughing)
> **Josh:** That's right, when it comes to giving examinations.

Whenever this scenario came up in a discussion, a few participants verbalized the sentiment that it was faculty's responsibility to make clear any expectations faculty had that students were not to talk publicly about tests or exams already taken. Verbalizations such as these verified survey respondents' comments about faculty responsibility in letting students know what they considered as appropriate test-taking etiquette. Contrary to the majority of faculty reporting disagreement that the student in this scenario is cheating, in the second focus group, one faculty member defends a different opinion—that in this scenario, the student *is* behaving dishonestly. In this exchange, Kendra sees this behavior as dishonest and tells why she believes this:

> **Sam:** But why would you not talk about an exam? [Asking] 'What did you get on question 6?' I mean that's something anybody would do. Actually, you know, they talk about the kinds of questions or what it was...or...
> **Helene:** Okay, so you would not consider that first person cheating?
> **Sam:** No.
> **Helene:** Okay, any other?
> **Kendra:** I think I probably would (say it is cheating). That may be my parochial school background too. You know, if I knew that there were other students that would be taking the exam, I would probably keep it to myself regardless who I was talking to. When I answered the question, there just wasn't any hesitation in my mind. Now, that's just the way I saw it.
> **Helene:** Do you have a gut reaction to it? [Looks at Sandi.]
> **Sandi:** My personal answer was no but that may be an artifact of how I do essays. I mean, they always know what the essays are going to be. I want them to talk to each other about it, and so I don't...ah...In a way, you can't cheat on my essay exams. I mean, unless you have someone else write your essays. I mean talking about it is okay. And I think that's just the difference in...
> **Sam:** ...[T]he expectation is that they're not talking about it, you know. Is that part of the instruction process when you give the exam, because if you're going to give it a bunch of different times, say 'Hey, you know, if you're going to talk about this with other folks who haven't taken the exam yet, then you know what? The grading scale, you know the way it works, then all you're going to do is cut your own throat.

Although only a few faculty members believed talking publicly about a test already taken is cheating, faculty who had strong beliefs about the behavior being dishonest and taking advantage of other students could conceivably send a student to the Honor System for such behavior. If a student were reported to the Honor System Director as an alleged violator of the Honor Pledge, the student could face an Honor Council hearing panel that places more credence in what the reporting *faculty* believes is cheating in his or her own course. Some faculty may have attended honor code institutions where talking about a test already taken is automatically defined as dishonest, especially in instances where not every student has taken the test in question.

EST COPY AVAILABLE

ST COPY AVAILABLE

Scenario II. The second scenario of student behavior depicted in the survey (as Item Q-20) is presented as follows: *A student uses the same book review for two different classes. Would you consider this cheating?*

Table 8 below, reports that of 354 survey respondents, 161 (45.5%) responded *yes* to the question; 144 (40.7%) responded *no* to the question; and 49 (13.8%) did not mark an answer. Clearly, in answering this scenario faculty members were split nearly in half.

Table 8

Q-20 Scenario 2-Using a book review for two different classes

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	161	45.5
No	144	40.7
No response	49	13.8

Note. n = 354.

More than in the first scenario, faculty felt it necessary to make qualifying comments next to the question. Comments were written by both those who answered *yes* and those who answered *no* that the scenario was or was not cheating. Some of the comments included:

-Not if it is student's own work and meets requirements for each class
-But I would have to make it clear ahead of time that it is not acceptable
-It depends on the context but I think it could be cheating.
-Can be very situation-dependent. What were the instructor's instructions?
-Depends on classes, appropriateness, whether book was new material, etc.
-Not sure, gray area
-Ground rules set down by the instructor
-Unless they clear it with instructors
-Not cheating, but dishonest if student represented the work otherwise

(Comments continue.)
- Depends-if substantial revision or modification-no
- SOMETIMES it may be appropriate to get extra mileage from some pieces of work.
- But a weak form that would not be discovered readily, cheating themselves
- It depends on if criteria for given course assignment are met
- Students should not take for credit two classes on the same subject at the same level.
- *Yes*, if it is exactly the same and *no*, if it was edited and improved.
- Double dipping. I make clear this is forbidden.
- Not if it is appropriate for both [instructor and student]
- If student clears doing so with BOTH instructors, ok. If not, it is questionable behavior, but not as bad as plagiarism.
- It depends. Is it okay with the teacher? Sometimes 'double dipping' is wrong, sometimes okay.
- These are really open-ended questions. Student should inform instructor that he/she has already reviewed the book.
- Unless the faculty rules for the assignment prohibit it.

When a cross-check was made on (a) the category discipline, and (b) answering *yes* to Scenario II, I found that more faculty from the disciplines of agricultural economics, architecture, English, family studies, history, journalism, and political science reported thinking that a student using the same book review in two different classes was cheating. It may be that faculty in these disciplines tend to use book reviews or reports more often than faculty in other disciplines.

Some qualitative comments on the questionnaire clearly place faculty input and faculty instructions to the class as necessary pieces of information before appropriateness can be determined. Other comments place responsibility on students to inquire from their instructors if this behavior is appropriate. In speaking with one faculty member in an interview, I heard a tone of weariness, suggesting that this scenario is cause for faculty and student dialogue and trust building instead of clear-cut *yes* and *no* answers about what is cheating:

> **Kirby:** So, I try to anticipate the moral dilemma on whether or not there are choices, trying to get them to recognize that the choice might be a moral or ethical dilemma and then try to help them reason through what they need to do in order to deal with that. And, of course, what I'm really trying to get them to say is that ultimately, what *really* matters is that if you have an obligation to somebody else. That is, if you're a student and your obligation is to a professor in a course or if you're a professional, then you have ethical obligations to your clients, to the public, to the licensing boards, all of these kinds of things. Ultimately, the interpretation of things probably comes through open communication. So, the more important way to solve this question is [to] ask, 'Is this acceptable to do this?' From my perspective, I would rather a student come to me and say, 'You know what, I've got a term paper assignment in two classes. And, one of my classes is a methods class and one of them is a history class. Couldn't I really focus on the same issue in one paper and come up with one paper that's half again longer or more complex and have a methods component and a history component in the big thing. And we all agree on the firm end that the paper that I turn in one class actually goes beyond the assignment in that class and I'll turn the same paper in the other class and it will go beyond the assignment in that class. But together the product is worth more in terms of its integrative and problem solving than it would have been to write two simple papers in each one. If they're 10 page papers, I may end up with 20 pages, but two papers at 20 pages may not show near as much advanced problem solving as one paper of 20 pages. It may be actually simpler to write one paper of 15 and have it worth more value in my learning than to write two 10-page papers.' I say, okay, so I'm telling you that as this instructor, 'I think that's okay.' Does that mean you can go ahead and do it? Not until you negotiate it with everybody else, with *all* parties (meaning all instructors involved).

Clearly, the message from this faculty member is for students and faculty to enter into dialogue about assignments, with the intent to find appropriate scholarly behavior acceptable to both student and instructor, behavior that is also ethical with each party.

Scenario III. Item Q-21, the third scenario in the questionnaire, refers to student behavior commonly known to occur within the K-State student population. The scenario is written as: *A student studies an old test in a Greek house file. Would you see this as cheating?* On the following page, Table 9 illustrates how survey faculty responded in each category—*yes*, *no*, and *no response*. Of 359 faculty members responding to this item, 19.5% answered *yes* that reviewing old tests in various group living files is dishonest and taking advantage of those who do not have access to the old tests. Three fourths of the participants indicated that this behavior would *not* be cheating in their estimation. As mentioned later in this section, one or two faculty put old tests on file in the library to make them more accessible to students not residing in grouped living areas such as residence life halls and Greek houses.

Table 9

Q-21 Scenario 3-Using Old Tests Such as Those Kept in Greek Houses

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	70	19.5
No	272	75.8
No response	17	4.7

Note. n = 359.

Interesting and conflicting comments on the questionnaire included the following:

-Not clear how exam was obtained. If stolen, definitely cheating.
-But it's not fair either
-Only if old test was taken to Greek house with instructor's permission
-We shouldn't keep giving the same tests!
-Only if still in use in the course; if same as current test, yes
-Depends on faculty stipulation
-The instructor's challenge is to help students learn to make judgments about what is appropriate and is not appropriate.
-Depends on whether teacher who gave test allowed students to keep tests
-Only if the instructor said this was not allowed
-If it confers an advantage other students don't have
-No, if students are allowed to keep exams, unless it was for my class (students are not allowed to keep exams)
-Unfair advantage-not all have access
-Depends whether the instructor freely let students access old exams or not
-If the test was not obtained legitimately, this could be a problem. I like to give all students the same opportunities.

(Comments continue.)

-Many instructors make old exams available. No guarantee same questions will be on the current year's exam.
-No, if the test is publicly available; this is proper preparation for a test
-Unless exam was acquired unethically
-Assuming the test is not the SAME test, but an older version
-I wish some did not have such an in-house advantage over others, but it is not 'cheating' per se.
-*Unless* the student stole the exam or was supposed to return it and didn't.
-The teacher should prepare current exams

For some faculty members, the question whether old test files are appropriate to use was based on whether the test is still in current use. For others, the appropriateness was determined on whether or not all students in the class have access to the tests. For this reason, some faculty members placed old tests on reserve in the library, where they are accessible to students regardless of living arrangement.

One faculty member became familiar with Greek house and residence life files only after a painful learning experience as evidenced by the following words of a focus group faculty participant:

> **Sandi:** I did something stupid. I always make them [quizzes] open-book. It doesn't help [being open-booked]. They think it does, but it doesn't help. They have to read it. And, [they are also] open-note. And I realized about five years ago that I had been passing back the quizzes. A lot of the Greek houses have huge files, and so I would get these kids in class who would have stacks of pretty notes and I'd say to myself 'Why is this person done in three minutes?' And I felt very stupid when I realized that and so now I never give quizzes back and I never give any test booklets back. They get back an answer sheet and they get back their essay.

Scenario IV. Item Q-22, the fourth scenario in the questionnaire, illustrates the following student behavior: *A student completes three science lab reports, withdraws from the class due to sickness, reenrolls another semester, and uses the same reports again. Would you consider this as cheating?* Table 10, on the following page, reports responses to Scenario IV. Interestingly, these response percentages are similar to the response percentages in Scenario III. Of the 357 respondents, almost 75% marked the *no* option and 17.6% marked the *yes* option. Many more faculty members reported their opinion that the student was not being dishonest in using his or her own work from the previous semester. This scenario concerned lab work. It would be interesting to learn if faculty members also believed the behavior not dishonest if other types of assignments were concerned.

Table 10

Q-22 Scenario 4- Reusing Lab Reports in Two Separate Semesters

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	63	17.6
No	266	74.5
No response	29	8.1

Note. n = 357.

When I conducted a cross-check on (a) the category discipline and, (b) answering *yes* to Scenario IV, I found that participating faculty from the science disciplines such as biology, biochemistry, chemistry, and physics tended to see turning in the same lab reports over two semesters as being academically dishonest.

Some faculty members, in areas other than the pure sciences such as biology or chemistry, also used lab reports and had another concern—the amount of collaboration that occurs among classmates. A focus group faculty participant bemoaned the different class approaches and how faculty may be confusing students across disciplines:

> **Kendra:** Different professors, like [in] the biological sciences, [have students] get together in groups and work on a group project together and everybody gets the grade. In the fields of science [where] labs [are used], students are told to work together and the group gets the grade for the group project. Well, when they come

> in and take my class and take the lab and I hand out the individual lab reports, they're supposed to do it themselves and not get together with their lab partners. And they're [students] really confused about that because they come from other classes where they have to work together.

Although Kendra mentioned later that she is up front with students about what is accepted and what is not appropriate, she finds that students still do not *get the message*. Students in her class continue to work collaboratively on lab assignments.

Summary

In summary, faculty members in this study preferred to write words such as *cheating*, *plagiarizing*, and *copying* when asked to fill three blank questionnaire boxes with a word or phrase depicting academic dishonesty. The percentage of survey faculty using at least one of these three words was very high and shows faculty agreement when it comes to using one word or a similar phrase in thinking about student behavior as being dishonest. Faculty agreement was not as evident when scenarios were presented and survey faculty were asked to consider whether or not student behavior in the scenarios was seen as dishonest or cheating. While most faculty reported their options of *yes*, *no*, and *no response* by circling the letters of their choice to the question *Is this cheating?*, many wrote comments next to item options to reflect clarification or circumstances under which they considered the behavior cheating. All comments written next to scenario options were qualitatively analyzed for insight into the conditions under which faculty deemed student behavior as academically dishonest.

Question 2: What Practices Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Engage In When Disseminating Information About Cheating?

To obtain possible answers to this question, I asked faculty if they were *aware* of the current University policy on academic dishonesty, the Kansas State University

Undergraduate Honor System, and if so, *how familiar* they were. Survey faculty, as well as focus group and individual interview faculty, either discussed opinions and practices or they responded to survey items offering a list of possible practices they used. Specific faculty practices in *verbal* and *written* communication were reported from the survey, individual interviews, focus groups, and first-day class sessions I attended at the beginning of each semester. Also noted is *how* and *when* verbal and written communication occurred with students. Mention is also made of study participants' use of the Honor Pledge and the Honor System web site as methods to convey to students information about dishonest scholarly acts.

Faculty Familiarity with the KSU Honor System

In items Q-1 and Q-2 on Part I of the questionnaire I sought information concerning (a) whether KSU participating undergraduate teaching faculty were familiar with the Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System, and (b) how familiar faculty were with its structure and procedures. With familiarity of the policy and knowledge about procedures, faculty members should be better able to disseminate information to students and better able to educate students about behaviors that are considered cheating. It was helpful to know the extent to which participants reported being knowledgeable about the Honor System and to determine what information faculty were disseminating to students. Table 11 at the top the following page reports that of 364 faculty who responded to the first question asking if they were familiar with the Honor System, 346 answered *yes*, just over 95%. Almost 5% of the faculty respondents, those 18 respondents answering *no*, did not report familiarity with the institutional policy under which students are currently bound.

EST COPY AVAILAB

Table 11

Q-1 and Q-2 Faculty Self-reports on Familiarity with KSU's Honor System

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	346	95.1
No	18	4.9

Note. n = 364.

Of the faculty who answered *yes* on being familiar with the Honor System, 34% or 119 respondents rated themselves as being *somewhat familiar* or *familiar* with the Honor System Just over 5% or 19 faculty members indicated they were *very familiar* with the Honor System. Even though a high percentage of the study participants were aware that the KSU Undergraduate Honor System was implemented as a university policy, a much smaller percentage reported having a working knowledge of the procedures involved. An example of the extent of one faculty member's familiarity with the Honor System ensues with this excerpt of conversation with a faculty member who agreed to talk about a personal episode of handling academic dishonesty:

> **Helene:** Are you familiar with the Honor System?
> **Marian:** Oh sure.
> **Helene:** You are. Okay…
> **Marian**: I mean I read the rules.

Reading the rules does not necessarily translate into a great depth of familiarity with the KSU Honor System itself. Certainly there are procedures or *rules* that faculty should follow, but there is much more to the Honor System than rules—principle ethics. The Honor System is also based on a philosophy of community and shared responsibility—virtue ethics. It was not surprising that an even smaller number of participants in the total study—survey, classroom observation, and interview faculty—could articulate the student development philosophy supporting the Honor System. One interview participant began his interview with this opinion:

> **Kirby:** One of the things that struck me about that (the survey) was that…much of what the university has been focusing on (and I use the term university rather generically) anybody involved with the Honors [KSU Honor System] program has been focused on what is and is not cheating and what do we do about those who engage in it. And I think that it seeks (and this isn't necessarily a good thing or a bad thing) but it seeks to *eliminate cheating* as something different than seeking to *cultivate integrity*.

Upon hearing this, I asked him if he had accessed the Honor System web site; he replied he had not done so recently. Within the interview, I briefly explained some of the philosophy behind the Honor System. It is true that Honor System goals and objectives address prevention, detection, and adjudication of dishonest student behavior. However, alongside these goals is also an encouragement of the campus community to dialogue on cultivating integrity. This might be another way to describe the student development philosophy guiding Honor System policy and procedure.

Taking Time to *Discuss* What Constitutes Cheating

In answering part of the second guiding question, Table 12 on the following page reports faculty opinions on Item Q-4, whether students generally come to college knowing what constitutes cheating in the classroom. Of 357 respondents, 71.7% or 256 faculty reported that they *agree* or *strongly agree* that students generally understand what behavior constitutes a dishonest scholarly act. On the other hand, 28.3% or 101 respondents indicated they *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that students are aware of what constitutes cheating when they come to college. Research on students' awareness of what constitutes cheating has been consistently reported as contrary to what faculty members believe about students (Barnett & Dalton, 1981; Jendrek, 1992; Nuss, 1994). Students many times report they have acted in ways they do not consider cheating. Faculty and students do not see cheating in the same light.

Table 12

Q-4 Faculty Opinions on Student Knowledge About What Constitutes Cheating

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	41	11.5
Agree	215	60.2
Disagree	90	25.2
Strongly Disagree	11	3.1

Note. n = 357.

It is interesting to note that participants' opinion percentages on Q-3 (Table 13 on page 120), asking whether an instructor should take class time to *discuss* what constitutes academic dishonesty, are split in approximately the same percentages as Table 12 above noting if faculty believe students come to college already knowing what constitutes cheating behavior. Table 13 at the top of the following page reports that 79.9% of the respondents answered they *agree* or *strongly agree* that instructors should take class time to discuss dishonesty issues; slightly over 20% *disagree* or *strongly disagree* time should be devoted to disseminate information about cheating. Some faculty wrote comments directly on the questionnaire next to Item Q-3 concerning the *verbal* discussion of academic dishonesty in class.

Table 13

Q-3 Faculty Opinion on Whether Instructors Should Take Class Time to Discuss What Constitutes Academic Dishonesty

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	89	25.6
Agree	189	54.3
Disagree	62	17.8
Strongly Disagree	8	2.3

Note. n = 348.

The comments, listed below, are parameters some faculty believe are necessary for the practice of talking about cheating to students in a classroom format:

-Especially in the context of the particular class: lecture, studio, lab, etc.
-Briefly
-In the best of all possible worlds, but at KSU, as things are in the real world,
    you'd *better*
-Respondent wrote this word under the word *discuss* in the item: mention
-Varies with class level/Perhaps inform students at their freshman orientation

When asked in Item Q-9 to report the average time they spent, in minutes, *talking* with students in a typical class about what constitutes academic dishonesty, participating survey respondents answered in a range from *no time* to *an hour*. Of the 365 respondents for this item, a mean of 6.4 minutes was tabulated and reported in Table 14 found on the top of the following page. The standard deviation for this item is shown as 8.16 minutes. In analyzing the range from not talking about cheating at all to talking one hour, I found that of 365 faculty who reported information in this question, 23 faculty reported talking over 15 minutes, with the rest talking less than 15 minutes and 57 faculty reporting not talking at all.

Table 14

Q-9 Faculty Self-reports on Average Time Talking About Cheating in Typical Class

Mean Time in Minutes	Standard Deviation
6.4	8.16

Note. n = 365.

In Part II of the questionnaire, Items Q-8 and Q-10, faculty members were asked to mark the practices describing *how* and *when* they disseminated information about cheating to students. Within these two items, four answer options included items depicting *verbal* dissemination of information about dishonest behaviors. Table 15 below reports how faculty disseminated information using *verbal* interaction, either in class, with a student, or with a group of students.

Table 15

Q-8 Faculty Self-reports on How Information Was Disseminated

Responses	Frequency	% of Respondents
Made verbal announcements to the total class	263	70.1
Placed a statement in my class syllabus	307	84.1
Conversed with one to two students (face to face)	83	22.7
In a phone conversation with a student	10	2.7

(table continues)

Table 15

Q-8 Faculty Self-reports on How Information Was Disseminated

Responses	Frequency	% of Respondents
Conversed with a group of more than two students	19	5.2
Sent an e-mail message to the student(s)	23	6.3
Referred student(s) to policy in *Inside KSU*	87	23.8
Referred student(s) to K-State's Honor System web page (www.ksu.edu/honor)	128	35.1
Other	30	8.2
Did not do any of the above	14	3.8

Note. n = 365. Marking multiple items was possible.

Respondents marked any options that applied to their situation. Of 365 respondents. 70.1% marked *verbal announcements to the total class*. 22.7% reported *conversing with one or two students* face-to-face. 2.7% reported using a *phone conversation with a student*. and 5.2% reported *conversing with a group of two or more students at a time*.

When faculty were asked *when* they disseminate information about cheating to students. some of the items also depicted a *verbal* option. Table 18 notes. much later in this section on page 134. 32.4% reported *verbally* disseminating information about cheating when they *discuss an academic assignment* and 13.5% indicated disseminating information *when a student has asked specific questions about cheating*. Assuming that students asked these specific questions while in discussion with faculty members. then faculty members were *verbally* disseminating information about cheating.

Some study participants in other components of the study—classroom observations and individual interviews—also took class time to *discuss* dishonest scholarly behavior. Sixteen classroom observations were made on the first day of classes during fall 2000 and spring 2001 semesters. Eight of the sixteen instructors observed *either made comments to their classes* about their own classroom policies or referred students to access the KSU Undergraduate Honor System web site. Several instructors had clear instructions on how student assessment was conducted and how assignments were to be done. Some faculty further explained their expectations in a *verbal* format:

> **Larry:** On academic dishonesty, the exams are proctored, the quizzes are not proctored. The penalty for cheating on the quizzes is posted on the web site. I've never had a problem with this in the past. Keep your eyes on your own paper so we won't have a problem.
>
> **Reba:** (Referring to the new system and web site) I don't treat you any different. I won't go out of my way to mistreat you and I expect you to do the same for me. See this poster (points to the HC poster on chalkboard). I don't put the Pledge on all tests, but you assume it is there.
>
> **Joan:** I will give you a handout about cheating and plagiarism later. You cannot use another class's research.

In individual faculty interviews with those who volunteered a personal experience in handling a cheating episode, a few faculty members also talked about their *verbal* instructions to classes:

> **Beth:** And throughout the semester, I told them that they had to follow professional ethics because if these stories were published and they had followed ethics any less than professional, not only would their reputations be on the line, but so would mine. You know and I talk integrity so much that I think these people must think I'm, like I'm a record that skips back to the same place.
>
> **Lucy:** I clearly said, 'This is not a group project. It's an individual assignment. It's not a hard assignment. Take some responsibility. You know, believe me, we have enough group assignments. This one's not hard. You can do this.'

> (Comments continue.)
> **Rita:** ...and I've always said something to students all along the way…that this was cheating. And for the most part they don't assume that it's cheating. They think that because I didn't *say* [it was cheating]. I always say this, or since that time I've put it in my syllabus, *Individual work unless otherwise noted.* But if I didn't say it out loud before the assignment, they don't assume that's cheating. And I explain to them, 'Yes it *is* because it wasn't on their own and it looked exactly the same.'

As evidenced in the survey results, a number of study faculty members did not report feeling the need to *verbally* communicate to their students what constitutes cheating. In Item Q-3 of the questionnaire, slightly over 20 % of the faculty responded they *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed* an instructor should take time to *discuss* in class what defines cheating. Of the sixteen classrooms I visited informally at the beginning of each of two semesters, eight out of sixteen instructors did not *verbalize* their own classroom policies, or those of the university. Of those eight instructors, four also did not have a section in their syllabi addressing academic dishonesty. This does not mean that academic integrity was not mentioned in a later class or that instructors did not use written instructions on individual assignments as they were assigned. It might give the message to students, however, that academic integrity is not a priority issue needing to be addressed *verbally* on the first day of class or in the syllabus, a *written* artifact seen by the university as a contract between instructor and student.

It may be that faculty members assume that students already know what constitutes cheating from one instructor's setting to another. The following conversation illustrates an instructor's view concerning students' understanding about the appropriateness in one setting not necessarily being appropriate in another setting:

> **Helene:** I know I've talked to people in other departments who think that it confuses students depending on where the instruction is...like in (names another college). They also have lab work to do and they don't encourage the

> (Comments continue.)
> collaboration during the lab work. So, what are your feelings about what the students should think?
> **Jesse:** Well, (chuckles), and maybe I'm an old fogy, but I believe that someone who is to be treated as an adult is, has entered as a student in the university, can't or won't be easily confused by different situations in different classes. I think the students very easily can differentiate between (names the college mentioned) where they aren't supposed to work together and (names his own college) where they are.

In summary, although a good number of survey respondents reported that they *agree* or *strongly agree* that class time should be taken in talking about cheating behaviors, not all K-State faculty members in this study did communicate *verbally* what student behaviors are seen as cheating. First-day class visits did not support the suggested survey faculty practice of *talking* about academic dishonesty. The questionnaire is not a tool with which to generalize with certainty to the total population of KSU undergraduate faculty, nevertheless, the questionnaire was returned by at least a majority of Kansas State's undergraduate teaching faculty. The classroom observations do suggest that some faculty have not made it a practice to *verbally* address academic dishonesty in their classrooms.

Giving *Written* Instructions About What Constitutes Cheating

For Item Q-5, Table 16 on the top of the following page reports that 60.9% survey respondents answered they *agree* or *strongly agree* that instructors should give *written* instructions to students about what constitutes academic dishonesty, while 39.1% *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with this instructor practice. These percentages are somewhat lower than the percentages reported on page 120 in Table 13 concerning instructors' opinions about *verbally* disseminating such information.

Table 16

Q-5 Faculty Self-reports on Written Dissemination of Information About Cheating

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	56	15.6
Agree	162	45.3
Disagree	120	33.5
Strongly Disagree	20	5.6

Note. n = 358.

As indicated in Table 15 on page 121, of 365 respondents to Item Q-8, asking *how* faculty members disseminate information, 307 or 84.1% suggested they *placed a statement in the class syllabus*. Slightly over 5% of the faculty marked *sending students email* as a *written* form of information dissemination. Another 31% of surveyed faculty reported disseminating information *before an assessment* such as a project, a paper, a test or quiz, and although this percentage was not broken down into *verbal* or *written*, it is conceivable that faculty may have written such information on instructions for the assessment.

Item Q-5 of the questionnaire relates to the practice of providing students with *written* information about academic dishonesty. *Written* information about cheating can be considered as brief as a paragraph about plagiarism and cheating found on a syllabus or mention of the Honor System web site in an email communication, or *written* communication can be as comprehensive as found on assignment sheets given to students detailing the requirements of the assignment. Faculty comments written directly on the questionnaire next to Item Q-5 suggest a small portion of the responding faculty deem giving *written* information about what constitutes cheating an unnecessary faculty practice. Examples of comments include:

- -But shouldn't need to
- -But shouldn't have to, students should know
- -Sometimes
- -Reference to University web site
- -Should not really be necessary except in special cases
- -Depends. Students know not to peek on tests. Students need extra instruction on standards of plagiarism. This is an issue for some but not of my classes.
- -We do not have time for this in lecture
- -I post a warning on my syllabus with a reference to the Honor System web page- but not written instructions could legitimately cover ALL possible violations thoroughly.
- -This is university, not grade school. Guidance might be necessary for research papers. I disagree in general, exception: research papers.

Some faculty members recognize that there may be a need to provide some information, *verbal* or *written*, on assignments, especially when the issue involves whether or not collaboration is authorized on an assignment. Faculty in both focus groups and in individual interviews related why this is an issue of concern for students and faculty. The first two participant comments are from the first focus group; the third comment is from a member of the second focus group; and the last two comments are from individual faculty interviews.

> **Randy:** It's very important in my field that students learn how to collaborate. They need to be able to work together on team projects, but at the same time they need to be able to do things on their own. There's always a tension when you've got a group project. Is somebody just along for the ride or are they actually part in it? It's very valuable for students to talk with one another and to help each other and figure out what is wrong with their [projects]. And I personally don't discourage that and I don't know of anyone who does. But you can see how it becomes difficult to draw a line. You can get two identical copies that were clearly made by electronically copying one from another. You can tell there's something wrong here. But sometimes it can be difficult for students to really see the difference, I think.

> (Comments continue.)
> **Dennis:** I talk to them in labs about their lab work. [I tell them] that they can work together, you know, collect the data, but when they write it, it's got to be done by themselves.
> **Sam:** One of the issues with the reason why we're doing that [teaching using collaborative assignments] is that in the world of work you don't operate independently. Most people have to work with other folks. And so one of the skills we're trying to do...is to get students to learn to work together. And, in fact, you may have a team member that's not pulling [his or her] own weight, so as a team, what do you do? Somebody has to step forward. You have to get the job done, but then there ought to be in place, [something to] deal with that situation. So we have group projects in my classrooms, but I have them do an individual focus paper when they get finished indicating what grade [reflects what] they did to the project, and what they perceived their other team members did that made a contribution to the project. So in fact we can get to an individual grade, when we take a look and match those up...yeah...four of five of these things say, 'This is what happened.' Here's the fifth person off here...doesn't look like they did anything. They didn't admit it, but the other four say they didn't. So, you have some kind of an indicator of that kind of situation too.
>
> **Marion:** But you should not come up with the same solution, because choice B results in choices C and D. And, it is unlikely by the end of the [project] that you're going to have identical solutions. [I wrote a note to each student], to both students that I have no objections to their studying together, [I set parameters].
>
> **Rita:** I'll tell you one thing I did this semester. I have a different group of students but in that same (names class) class. I showed them what I expected and I explained more carefully what I thought cheating was. So I took a little more time with that.

Another faculty, during an individual faculty interview, expressed the importance of integrity within a collaborative assignment and had this discussion with imaginary students:

> **Kirby:** Well, in my class last semester where I had some teams that had some personality conflicts and so forth. Is having a personality conflict cheating? If I don't want to have a committee meeting with you, you and I are on the same team, am I cheating if I don't want to come? The success of your project is dependent on me as a team member contributing. I have placed your work at jeopardy.

Collaborative student efforts are encouraged by some instructors and strictly forbidden by other faculty members. How do students know what is acceptable and appropriate scholarly behavior if faculty do not verbalize or write their expectations as part of the instruction for completing the task?

In 12 of the 16 classes I observed on the first day of classes, faculty had some form of *written* instructions about academic dishonesty. Most of these were instructions in class syllabi on reviewing academic dishonesty as defined by KSU faculty policy in the student handbook titled *Inside KSU* . Others referred students to the Honor System web site. Most instructions were brief and general in nature. This does not suggest that academic dishonesty issues were not addressed at a later date in the course. These observations were all made in the first-day sessions.

In summary, a smaller percentage of survey faculty indicated that, in their opinion, *written*, as opposed to *verbal*, information about cheating is needed. Some wrote that they did not have time, that the information should not be needed, and that this is university, not grade school. Other study participants discussed the need for written information on what constitutes cheating, especially when the issue of collaboration on assignments is unclear to students. Three-fourths of the faculty who were in the observation sessions did include some written information about cheating and plagiarism on the first day of classes. Written information about what constitutes academic dishonesty was given to students by K-State faculty who participated in this study.

How and *When* Information Is Disseminated

Tables 15 and 17, on pages 121 and 131 respectively, report respondent percentages to a variety of methods faculty used in disseminating information about cheating to their students. In Item Q-8, survey faculty respondents were asked *how* they furnished this information to their students. Beyond the already reported answers for *verbal* and *written* methods listed in the sections above, of 365 respondents, 87 (23.8%) marked that they referred students to a policy in *Inside KSU*, a Kansas State University phone book with university policies printed in a special section for students.

When I inquired in the Provost's office where students were able to find *Inside KSU*, I was informed that students must pay for the document that is updated yearly. The name of the section is no longer *Inside KSU*; the referenced section is now titled *Inside Student Life* and is a special color-coded student life handbook published in the campus directory, the K-State Campus Connection Phone Book with E-Mail (R. Dyer, personal communication, December 3, 2001). The KSU Office of Student Life is responsible for updating this section. If the number of students actually receiving this reference is small, due to its cost and inaccessible nature, it may be that faculty assumption about students' knowledge of the policy is unrealistic. Just over 35% of the respondents referred students to the K-State Honor System web home page (www.ksu.edu/honor) for information on university policy.

Survey faculty members were asked to list their own responses to *how* they disseminate information about cheating. Several comments furnished in the space provided for *other*, in Table 15 on page 121, included:

-Talked about it from a professional standpoint, they are going to be teachers
-Had honors skit in dept seminar
-Gave a quiz
-Wrote a long letter
-A member of Honor System came to class to discuss
-We do a session on academic honesty and use case studies
-Integrate into course policy
-By example of integrity and trust, my actions
-Honor System web site linked on class web site
-Dept. Handbook (catalog)
-Referred students to ref pages in writing handbooks, etc.
-Mentioned to class after a bad case of homework copying

EST COPY AVAILABLE

(Comments continued.)
-Note to specific students
-Threaten to send them to President Wefald

Clearly, participant faculty used a variety of methods in communicating to students how they, as students, should conduct themselves as scholars. Some faculty also educated students about the KSU Undergraduate Honor System and its policies and procedures, through either verbal comments or space devoted for this purpose in their syllabi. Some faculty referenced the Honor System web site home page.

For Item Q-10, Table 17 on the following page reports frequency and percentage of participant faculty reporting *when* they disseminated information about cheating to their students. Item Q-10 allowed faculty to choose from seven options. Faculty members were also instructed to choose *as many* practices as was applicable to their own situations. Therefore, percentages reported are of the number of faculty who marked a particular item out of the pool who answered any items in Q-10 of the questionnaire.

Table 17

Q-10 Faculty Self-reports on When Information Was Disseminated

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Handing I handed out the syllabus	301	82.7
Within the first week of classes	126	34.6
When I discussed an academic assignment	118	32.4
When student asked specific a question	45	13.5
Before any student assessment	113	31.0

(table continues.)

Table 17

Q-10 Faculty Self-reports on When Information Was Disseminated

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Other	24	6.6
Did not disseminate information	15	4.1

Note. n = 364. Marking multiple options was possible.

Beyond figures already indicated for *verbal* and *written* methods, other faculty practices include (a) giving out information the first week of classes (34.6%), and (b) giving information before any student assessment (31.0%). Assessment was defined for faculty as including projects, papers, quizzes, tests, and exams. When faculty were asked to list their own responses to *when* they disseminate information about cheating, the *other* category in Table 17 above contained the following:

- Include in each assignment clear description
- Written comment on homework and take home exams
- When students questioned why they had a zero on an assignment for copying
- Handing back assignments
- When it seemed to be discovered, when violation occurred
- When students plagiarized
- Before any assessment mainly regarding covering papers to prevent 'temptation' to look at other's work
- Before the FIRST quiz only
- On questionable work not probably fraudulent, or fraudulent work I judged originated how ignorance (unknown word) might intent
- Midway through semester
- After grading papers that have even a hint of plagiarism
- Upper-division class research paper
- My attendance policy of working in class helps

Tables 15 on page 121 and 17 above and on the previous page also reflect the number of participants who responded that they did *not* disseminate information about cheating,

ST COPY AVAILABL

either in *verbal* or *written* form. Fourteen survey faculty members responded they did not practice any of the mentioned nine methods in disseminating information; fifteen respondents indicated they did not disseminate information about cheating at all. When these percentages are compared to percentages of faculty who *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed* about (a) taking class time to *discuss* cheating, or (b) disseminating written information about cheating, it is evident that more participants report engaging in the dissemination of information, regardless of their opinions on whether or not they believe they should do so.

Using the *Honor Pledge* As Information.

The Honor Pledge is a vital component of the Undergraduate Honor System and states, *On my honor, as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this academic work*. Some participants use the Honor Pledge as a means to inform students of the seriousness of committing academically dishonest acts. For Item Q-11, Table 18 at the top of the following page indicates that of 352 respondents, 201 (57.1% of the survey total), reported putting the Honor Pledge in their class syllabi. Respondents could mark more than one option. Thirty-five faculty, almost 10%, reported reminding students to be honest on examinations by placing the Pledge on the examination and having students sign it. Close to 7% reported placing the Honor Pledge on their final examinations. A smaller percentage of 4.3% respondents indicated including the Pledge on class assignments.

ST COPY AVAILABL

Table 18

Q-11 Faculty Self-reports on Where They Place the Honor System Honor Pledge

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Course syllabi	201	57.1
Course assignments	15	4.3
Course examinations (not including final)	35	9.9
Course final	24	6.8
Other	22	6.3
Did not put the Pledge on any of the above	129	36.6

Note. n = 352. Marking multiple options was possible.

When asked to furnish their own answers to other places they use the Pledge, some faculty wrote:

- -Course web page
- -Early exam
- -A sheet signed by all students at the start and conclusion of course
- -Door of office
- -Posted in lecture hall
- -Departmental student handbook
- -Course Description
- -On all work on which students weren't to work together (which was not all work in the class)
- -Term paper
- -Take home tests and quizzes
- -Respondent circled that he or she did not put Pledge on any of the above and wrote 'a shortcoming/failure on my part.'
- -Respondent wrote in brackets. 'good idea to increase this'

One faculty member sent a powerful message when he or she wrote about the Honor Pledge. 'Does not mean anything!' Without further investigation, it is not easy to tell why

EST COPY AVAILABLE

this faculty member believes this to be true. Even without verbalizing this sentiment in class, the respondent's attitude toward the Pledge may bias his or her communication about academic dishonesty to his or her students.

Of the sixteen classrooms I visited on the first day of classes for two semesters, faculty in one half of those classes either discussed the Honor Pledge verbally or devoted space in the syllabus to its mention. One instructor did not use the specific words *Honor Pledge*; however, she did encourage students to read the implied *statement* and do their own work. The instructor was referring to the Honor Pledge as being an implied statement made by students on any academic work, regardless of whether the students write out the Pledge on their work or not.

Other instructors in individual interviews, one struggling with the term *Honor Pledge*, did seem to grasp its meaning and tried to convey that meaning to their students:

> **Lucy:** And I actually, I actually looked up and I said something like, 'There's the,' not Honor, what's it called?
> **Helene:** The Pledge?
> **Lucy:** Yeah, the Pledge. And, in fact, I had it on my syllabus.
> **Helene:** You did?
> **Lucy:** Yes, so I went back and I indicated that at the beginning of the semester. Now, they didn't sign it or anything, I just put it on there.
> **Helene:** No, it's implied.
> **Lucy:** Right. And I said, 'This really puts me in a bad position. It puts me, it puts yourselves in a bad position.' And I said, 'You know the worst thing that can happen is that you can be kicked out of (she mentions the university college) for this.'
>
> **Martha:** Yeah, I have them sign the Honor's Pledge on their papers. Now, I just started doing that this fall, but just to make it clear to them.

It may be that because students do not frequently ask questions about cheating faculty assume that students in their classes already know what constitutes cheating. Table 19, on the following page, notes faculty responses to Item Q-6, faculty perceptions on how often students ask questions about what constitutes cheating. Well over half the faculty respondents reported that students never ask questions about dishonest behavior. In the sixteen classroom observations I made, not one student asked a question clarifying whether a behavior would be seen as cheating. Additionally, none of the faculty participants in the focus groups or the individual interviews talked about students inquiring about procedures and policies.

Table 19

Q-6 Faculty Perceptions on Students Asking Questions About Cheating

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Often	1	.3
Seldom	105	28.8
Never	258	70.9

Note. n = 364.

Although the faculty practices of talking with students about academically dishonesty acts and giving written expectations about what constitutes cheating on a particular assignment may take time and, in some cases communication skills beyond what is commonly known as *lecturing*, this practice is needed for students to make informed decisions on homework assignments and projects. Even if the percentage of college students knowledgeable about cheating is high, there are certain instances when information reinforces the expectations of faculty.

Using the *Honor System Web Site* As Information

While attending one first-day session in the College of Engineering, I noticed that the instructor referenced in her syllabus the Honor System web site home page as a place to find more information about the academic dishonesty policy. Wanting to find out how easy it would be for students to find the web site on their own in each of the colleges, I conducted a cursory search on each of the seven colleges' home pages. If I found the link to the Honor System on the home page, I categorized the find as a *first-tier linkage*. If I had to navigate to a second page to find a link to the Honor System, I categorized it as a *second-tier linkage*, and so forth. The results of my informal investigation are shown in Table 20 below.

Table 20

College Web Site Linkage to KSU Honor System Web Site Home Page

College	Linkage Tier
Agriculture	Third
Architecture	Fifth
Arts and Sciences	None-Individual Faculty
Business Administration	Third
Education	First
Engineering	Second
Human Ecology	None-Individual Faculty

Note. Linkage defined as steps in navigating to Honor System web site home page.

Five of the seven colleges provided a link to the Honor System, with the College of Education being the only college to link the Honor System on its own home page.

Presumably, the reason for first tier linkage is the College of Education's mission statement about preparing educators to be knowledgeable, *ethical*, and caring decision makers. Two colleges did not provide links, the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Human Ecology. There were faculty in *each* college, however, who did link the Honor System web site home page in their syllabi and on their own course web sites. Hale Library did not have a link. The Provost's home page did provide a second-tier link.

Summary

In summary, faculty in this study reported using a variety of methods and practices to disseminate information about cheating. Some faculty self-reported they *verbalized* their own expectations, as well as those of the university in the institution of the Honor System. *Written* information was also evidenced in syllabi sections devoted to describing the risks and consequences of plagiarizing and cheating, however the terms were defined by students reading them. A small percentage of survey faculty members did *not* report verbalizing class expectations, nor did one-half of the faculty in the observed first-day lectures. Although a greater percentage of survey faculty members had the opinion that *written* information was not as needed as *verbal* information, observation faculty used their syllabi as well as discussions as tools to disseminate information. Participants in this study, generally speaking, disseminated information, albeit scant amounts, about what they consider academically dishonest student behaviors. More than any other type of information, observation faculty's syllabi contained a generic paragraph referring to the general university warning about cheating and plagiarism, the Honor System's web site, or, in some cases, an outdated source—*Inside KSU*. A small percentage of survey faculty used the Honor Pledge as a means of disseminating information as well as expressing their values about taking the Pledge seriously. I found some web site linkage to the Honor System by both faculty and colleges, albeit a small percentage.

Question 3: How Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Handle Episodes of Cheating?

This section begins with reported results from the KSU Undergraduate teaching faculty survey on incidents of cheating. Faculty were asked if they were aware of any cheating incident(s) occurring in their courses during the four semesters from fall 1999 to spring 2001. If faculty were aware of such an incident, they were asked to continue by reporting the type of incident, the size of the class in which the incident took place, and the sanction the instructor took upon becoming aware of the incident. This section continues with the qualitative portion of the survey where select faculty related personal experiences in handling an episode of cheating. Finally, the section reports volunteered information on faculty perceptions about the difficulty of detecting cheating and how they attempt to prevent cheating.

Awareness of a Cheating Incident

On Item Q-12, Table 21 on the following page reports that of 366 respondents to this survey item, 188 or 51.4% of respondents indicated they were not aware of a cheating incident within the last four semesters of instruction--the time frame of the study. Almost 20% of the respondents reported a suspicion that a cheating incident may have occurred, but they did not know for certain. Eighty-three or 22.7% of the faculty reported being aware of an incident(s) and sanctioned the violator(s). Another 24 KSU undergraduate teaching faculty or 6.6% indicated that they were aware of an incident but did not sanction the violator(s).

Table 21

Q-12 Faculty Self-reports on Number of Cheating Incidents

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
No	188	51.4
Yes, and sanctioned violator(s)	83	22.7
Yes, and did not sanction violators(s)	24	6.6
I suspect, but don't know for certain	71	19.4

Note. n = 366. Incidents occurring during four academic semesters fall 1999 through spring 2001.

In a survey conducted at Kansas State University by Donald McCabe (1999), the percentage of K-State students who self-reported cheating in a number of situations ranged from 5% (turning in a paper from a paper mill or web site) to 39% (receiving unauthorized help with assignment even when instructor has asked for individual work) to 45% (getting questions and answers from someone who has taken a test). This raises the question: *Why are faculty members not aware of numerous instances of academic dishonesty?* One faculty member who was interviewed suggested:

> **Jesse:** Okay, I definitely do believe that faculty [members] who don't pay attention are not doing their students any favors. Ah, and I think, unfortunately there are a fair number of faculty who just really don't want to know.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Types of Cheating Episodes and Class Size Noted

Table 22 below notes the types of student cheating incidents reported by survey faculty. More than one option was possible. For Item Q-13, 178 respondents were either aware of or suspected 322 incidents of cheating. The student behavior most reported by respondents was that of *plagiarism on any assignment*--86 incidents or 26.7% of all types reported. A tie for the second most commonly reported cheating behavior occurred between (a) *unauthorized collaboration on any assignment* (69 incidents), and (b) *copying another student's assignment and turning it* (69 incidents). Sixty-four occurrences of *copying exam answers* were reported by faculty members. Six incidents of *using unauthorized materials during a quiz* and eight incidents of *using unauthorized aid*

Table 22

Q-13 Faculty Self-reports of Types of Cheating

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Plagiarism on any assignment	86	26.7
Unauthorized collaboration on any assignment	69	21.4
Copying exam answers	64	19.9
Copying another student's assignment and turning it in	69	21.4
Using unauthorized materials during a quiz	6	.02
Using unauthorized materials during an exam	20	.06
Using unauthorized materials during the final	8	.03

Note. n = 322 incidents of cheating. Marking multiple items was possible.

during an exam comprised a small percentage of the total amount of reported cases of misconduct.

Along with furnishing the above information on the type of cheating episodes in their classes, faculty also reported the approximate class enrollment where the cheating occurred. Table 23 below shows the class enrollment divided into three class size categories--5 to 20 students, 21-50 students, and over 50 students. Of 86 faculty members reporting infractions for the four-semester duration of the study, plagiarizing on any assignment was reported in higher numbers in the smaller two categories of class size. The number of those reporting the same incident occurring in classes with 50 or more students dropped by a total of nine incidents. It could be that in larger classes, faculty are

Table 23

Types of Violations and Class Enrollment When Each Occurred

Types of Cheating	Frequencies of Class Sizes		
	5-20	21-50	50+
Plagiarism on any assignment	34	34	25
Unauthorized collaboration on any assignment	22	29	22
Copying exam answers	19	18	28
Copying another student's assignment and turning it in	21	21	22
Using unauthorized materials during a quiz	1	1	3
Using unauthorized materials during an exam	3	4	7
Using unauthorized materials during the final	3	3	2

Note. n = 322 violations. Marking more than one option was possible.

not as apt to give assignments where plagiarizing takes place. Reported unauthorized collaboration on any assignment for the 21-50 class-enrollment size rose slightly over the other two categories of class enrollment. It appears that more incidents of copying exam answers were reported in the largest class enrollment size. Copying another student's assignment and turning it in remained fairly consistent across class enrollments for faculty reporting such behavior. Surprisingly, fewer faculty reported episodes of using unauthorized materials during a quiz, exam, or final, with only seven faculty reporting such student behaviors in classes with an enrollment of 5 to 20, eight faculty reporting with class enrollments of 21-50, and twelve faculty reporting from the over 50 student enrollment division.

It is clear from Tables 22 on page 141 and 23 on page 144 that more survey faculty reported finding students plagiarizing and using other student's materials in ordinary assignments than students using their own unauthorized materials during testing and assessment situations.

Types of Sanctions Used

Survey faculty members were also asked to report types of sanctions, if any, they used with students engaging in academically dishonest behavior. Of 83 faculty members who indicated they sanctioned offenders, some had more than one episode in four semesters. Another 71 faculty suspected cheating during this time frame but did not know for certain. Faculty also gave sanctions for suspected cases, the most common being a warning to the student. Table 24 at the top of the following page reports the nine sanctioning options taken by faculty, one of which is to describe any other types of sanctions faculty used besides those sanctions furnished.

Table 24

Q-14 Types of Sanctions Used

Types of Sanctions	Frequency	Percentage
Reported incident to Honor System Director	24	16.0
Gave a warning	75	48.7
Gave a failing grade on the test or assignment	69	44.8
Gave an XF in the course (F due to dishonesty)	17	11.0
Placed incident report in student's file	21	13.6
Recommended suspension from University	1	0.1
Recommended expulsion from University	0	0.0
Other	37	24.0
No sanction(s) given	36	23.4

Note. n = 154 sanctions used. Marking multiple items was possible.

Twenty-four faculty members reported they informed the Honor System Director of the cheating episode. The Honor System's web page reports a total of 80 cases of academic dishonesty reported campus-wide for the period of the study. A total of 75 warnings were reported as given to students by faculty who became aware of infractions of university or individual classroom policies. Sixty-nine faculty resorted to giving the student a failing grade. This was the second most common sanction used by reporting faculty. Thirty-two of these warnings came from faculty who suspected, but were not certain that cheating occurred. Seventeen respondents reported they opted to give the student engaged in cheating the standard sanction given by Honor Council hearing panels—an XF on the student's transcript, where failure in the course was indicated as due to academic dishonesty. Writing an incident report and placing it in the student's file was a sanction chosen by 21 faculty. Only one participating faculty member chose to suspend a student for cheating; no faculty sanctioned a student with expulsion.

When faculty were given the opportunity to describe or list other sanctions given to students besides the sanctions listed, a variety of comments were written on the questionnaire:

-Gave a warning and reexamined
-Copy of report to department head
-Received no points on extra credit/failed the course
-Counted specific item(s) being looked up as incorrect
-Letter put in the Honor System file
-Had student re-do assignment or receive a 0
-Required written apology, required counseling
-Demand rework of assignment, counsel individuals and groups of students on their responsibilities
-Reassigned independent work/provided opportunity for redemption
-Separated students for remaining exam/reminder of honor code
-Lowered grade two letter grades, conference w/violators individually
-The student reporting the incident would not carry it forward
-Informed the student as to WHY it was considered dishonest
-Share the grade among the students
-Was not positive about situation so I discussed the policy
-Gave a warning and did not count assignment/ gave a warning to the entire class
-Discussed appropriate citation and reduced final grade
-Only suspected, so had them skip a seat for all future exams
-Points off exam/loss of points for assignment
-Gave extra assignment after severe lecture
-Gave a failing grade [because] student did not turn in rough draft, could not warn
- Required rewrites in two cases (observed on rough drafts)
-Talked with athletic coordinator for academics

Generally speaking, survey faculty reported using a broad range of sanctions when they found students cheating in their courses. For the most part, faculty who reported suspecting academic dishonesty, but were not quite certain, reported giving warnings both to individuals and to the class as a whole.

Individual Faculty Interviews

Thirteen survey faculty agreed to an individual interview for a more in-depth reporting on a personal episode of how they handled episodes of academic dishonesty. I initiated each interview by encouraging participant members to just begin discussing their own experience with an instance of student academic dishonesty. Throughout the interview, if clarification was needed, I would ask questions that were more specific. In this section, I report faculty information in four categories. These categories include (a) the student behavior faculty deemed dishonest, (b) the student's reaction when caught by the instructor, (c) the sanction imposed on the student by the faculty member, and (d) expressions by faculty on how they felt during the entire process from discovering the cheating to dealing with the student in the aftermath.

A variety of student behaviors drew the attention of faculty as being dishonest in an academic setting. The majority of the offenses took the form of plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration on a paper or project. Three plagiarizing episodes were of the student using direct *words* of others and turning the assignment in as his or her own, examples of commonly known as instances of plagiarism. Two other cases, however, occurred where the students plagiarized a musical composition and another a set of architectural drawings, both work of another person, but not in the form of words; more in the way of a creation. Another two cases involved the plagiarizing of sources such as newspapers and web sites. In both of these instances, the students took liberal amounts of information and used it as their own work. Two cases involved students copying test answers from another person taking the same, or unbeknownst to the offender at the time, a different version of the test. In a situation sometimes hard to detect in a large auditorium-like classroom, another faculty member discovered, twice, a student answering a quiz question for another student not in attendance. All of these cases illustrate some of the same types of cheating behavior reported by faculty in the survey—plagiarizing, copying, and looking at another's test answers.

Some interview faculty gave good descriptions about the student behavior they considered dishonest. For other faculty, it was important to describe what they did not consider *serious* cheating. The following are excerpts from these faculty conversations:

> **Jacob:** In [names course], a student had a hard assignment to turn in for [names course]. He found an...example on the Internet, except he didn't realize that the comments were German because it came off a German site. It seems in cheating we catch the dumb ones. It's hilarious.
>
> **Ken:** ...that I'm trying to watch for cheating. What happened in this particular case was it was the very first exam of the semester and I had a young man, make something like 20 on the exam. And this is not, it's not a course that, you know, requires rocket science intellect to pass. But, I just didn't say anything, you know. I graded the test. I handed the test back. We went over it and a couple of days later, the young man came in to see me and he said, 'Dr. [names faculty],' he said, 'I've done something very bad.' And I knew.
>
> **Lucy:** So what happened was, what they did was, I think what they did was, about three of them, for example, might have worked together and I clearly said, 'This is not a group project. It's an individual assignment.... You know, I mean, believe me, we have enough group assignments....' And, what happened was they divided up the work, so for example, if three or four were working together and we were doing [names a part of the project], I took care of the definition, this person did the characteristics, this person did the causes, and this person did this. And then we all typed them and then we emailed them to each other and then we pasted them together and there's my paper. Well, what they didn't do is edit each other's work. Because the kinds of things that I saw, were not, I mean they were clearly grammatical errors or the word...written two times, you know, how sometimes you write a word twice and you need to edit it. Well, I mean, you know, what's the chances of four of them doing that same error?
>
> **Marion:** I teach a course called [names course] and I ask the students to do presentations on [names project] for the class and prepare a handout for class and so, as a result of their having to prepare a handout, I have a whole library of handouts from previous classes and previous students. Well, when I saw this one handout, I thought it looked terribly familiar. And, I knew that this student dated a

> (Comments continued.)
> person who had taken it in a previous semester. When I went through my old handouts, I saw that this student had replicated the handout of his girlfriend from the previous year. And, all he did was take her name off.
>
> **Rita:** Okay, I'll tell you about my class, or the one class that I teach. [Names class] and what it involves is lots of spreadsheets. And, in every semester, or in every one except for this one, students just share a disc, not even change anything. So, say they had a spreadsheet and I gave them an assignment to analyze this spreadsheet. One of the students would do it, save it, share it with another student and even though students have to turn in a disc and a hard copy, it would be the exact same assignment. And they never imagine, in a class of 50 that I would see that they'd be exactly the same.
>
> **Dave:** Um, I want to tell you about one case in particular. First of all, let me preface this by saying that very often students who begin [names courses] have no idea how to document sources...[and] very often don't cite the sources. They figure that if they don't quote specifically, you know, material that they could just put anything in there and not cite it. I don't consider that generally a case of cheating because what I do is I haul them into my office. I have them write two or three drafts for each paper and usually within two or three weeks the problem is gone.

Faculty who participated in these interviews seemed to relate more incidences of plagiarism and copying assignments than incidences of blatant cheating on exams or quizzes, much the same as what survey faculty reported. In discussing these cases, faculty defined what academic dishonesty constituted for them in their particular classes.

Almost all interview faculty members gave at least partial description of the student's reaction after being notified of the infraction. Some students readily admitted fault, whereas other students denied guilt even when presented with clear evidence of misbehavior. Following are excerpts from faculty where they discuss what they perceived were students' reactions to being caught:

> **Beth:** And I asked her about it and she didn't talk a lot. She didn't deny it. She didn't confess to it. She just kind of let me talk and when I asked her direct questions, I got 'yes' and 'no' answers. She didn't look happy, but she was certainly composed and at the end, I told her the series of actions I could take, which were serious. And we talked about the ethics of it, but, again, she was not

EST COPY AVAILABL

(Comments continued.)
really responsive. She seemed pretty matter-of-fact about it. My suspicion is that she was probably very upset inside and was trying to keep her head low.

Dick: And so. I did. I said. you know, to the student. 'This is your exam. Can you explain to me how you came up with these answers?' And she really didn't say anything, you know. She said, 'Well, I don't know. I just guessed.' And I said. 'Well, is there any process why you can show me why you put this number down as opposed to just any number at random?' 'No, I just put it down at random.' I said, well then I had to explain to her that it was in fact the right number for the other version. She basically just said, 'Well.' She just kind of shut up on me, and she didn't say anything. So, at that point, I said, 'Well, I believe it to be a case of where you really looked off another paper.'

Jesse: It's hard for me to really understand what the students are feeling, although, the first time around, one of the students was REALLY, very much shaken up about having to go before the Honor Council and have a hearing, and his father was very shaken up too. Another case last semester, why the young man who admitted immediately that he was giving answers for other people, I'm not sure whether he EVER truly appreciated the gravity of what he was doing. You might think that he was avoiding me, quite the opposite. He was happy to see me; I was his friend because I, I'm not sure exactly why, because...but even just before the hearing when I'd see him in the hall, why he'd smile and wave big and say hello. So, the students seem to have varying responses.

Ken: I looked up and said, 'Ah, what is that?' He said, 'Well,' he said, 'I cheated on your exam.' And, so I acted surprised and said, 'Really?' And he said, 'Yah.' He assured me that the person sitting next to him had no idea that he was sneaking glances at his paper, that the other student was not involved in it in anyway. So, we had a long discussion about cheating and the wisdom or lack thereof in cheating. As it turned out, he dropped the class and I decided not to follow through with the letter. The young man seemed to be very sincere to me and his embarrassment over having cheating and his assurances to me that it wasn't worth it and it would not be a problem for him in the future, he'd learned his lesson. He convinced me and so I let the matter drop.

Leo: The student acknowledged that he knew he had made a mistake. He came in and we talked about what this would mean and since then he's left the university. He would lose his fee waiver, if he didn't stay in our college and this meant that he would have to take the course over again, so he knew he was wrong and he said, 'You know, under pressure here, I know I made a bad choice. I don't know why I did it.' And so on and so forth. But he acknowledged doing it and he had enough, you know, character to say 'I was wrong and I'm going to deal with the consequences. I just need to know what the consequences are going to be.'

> (Comments continued.)
> **Lucy:** The other two got very reactive. They did not take responsibility. 'How dare that I say they were cheating? It was not clear that it wasn't a group assignment'...They said, "Well, you didn't say it. You know you didn't say we couldn't work with others'....The three that came in did, in their own ways, broke down and they took responsibility and they said 'Yeah, we did copy.' But no one said, 'But someone's grade should be lower than mine.' or that kind of thing. That didn't come out. And, I was quite surprised by the ones I got back that were defensive because they clearly did not take responsibility.
> **Helene:** Why, what do you think makes that difference? Here you've got three who have admitted, and two who are defensive. They're in the same program.
> **Lucy:** (Pause) You know, I honestly think it has to do with a personality type. I see more students today that don't take responsibility than I did in the past.

The third theme I gleaned from interviewing faculty who volunteered a personal episode of dealing with student cheating was the array of sanctions used. Most faculty related sanctions like those found in the survey in Item Q-14, sanctions such as giving a failing grade on a test or assignment and reporting the incident to the Honor System. Some faculty gave unique sanctions and one gave a sanction, only to retract it later. Examples of how faculty decided to sanction their students included:

> **Beth:** I told her the series of actions I could take, which were serious. You know, ranging from putting this in her student file. And what I ultimately opted to do was to fail her on that assignment and give her a zero on that assignment and she did not have any option to make up that work. In the end results were that it lowered her grade in that class by one letter grade when everything was said and done.

> **Dick:** Another one where they had an explanation. I have doubts, but I just didn't think it would stand up to scrutiny. I just didn't think the case was strong enough and so I sort of, you know, gave them a little lecture and (chuckles) and sent them on their way.

> **Dave:** I'm thinking of one in particular last year where a student did not turn in a rough draft of the final paper. The reason that I always ask them to turn in a rough draft is so that I can catch things like this immediately, get them in here, and we go through and they go back and do the research again and turn in a final document that's documented correctly. He did not and so, of course, I failed him on the paper because I had no choice. It was, there were whole sections of it that were clearly not in his language.

(Comments continued.)
Helene: Right.
Dave: I probably could have taken it further but didn't feel, you know, his work in the rest of the class was so good that I didn't feel that it was warranted at that time. So, I just wanted to tell you a little bit about that part. It did bring his grade from an A to a C.

Jacob: I have a mechanism for catching cheaters when they do [names type of assignment] assignments. Last semester I had a dozen students who showed evidence of plagiarism. I gave them a 0 for the assignment OR the choice to take it up with the Honor Council. If they did take it up with the Honor Council, I told them that I would exercise my option to assign them an XF for the course.

Ken: Anyway, what I told the young man I was going to do, and I, as it turned out I did not follow through. What I told him I was going to do was that I was going to write a letter to his advisor informing the advisor that I had in essence had a confession from him of cheating on the exam. I was going to give him a zero on the exam itself, and allow him to continue in the class.
Helene: I see.
Ken: Ah, as it turned out, he dropped the class and I decided not to follow through with the letter.

Kirby: So, if I get a term paper that looks to me like what could easily be called plagiarism, I'm more likely, especially on a first offense, if you want to call it that, to call the student in and say, 'There're a number of technical errors in this and I'm sure that you don't mean to do something you're not supposed to do, but here's how you have to give credit to other people's work when you use it. It's okay to use it, but here's how you have to use it.' And then I ask them to redo it. So, that's a 'no penalty' thing? It's not a penalty that holds with them. It's an extra work, but it's part of a learning thing.

Leo: Absolutely so clear. We had no choice here but to confront the student. And at that point, I called Phil Anderson [Director of KSU Honor System] and the department head pretty much on the same day and said, 'Here's what's happened. And you can see [the evidence].' I did go over and show them to Phil, the original [work] by another student...and he agreed just a clear cut case....and, um, so Phil contacted the student saying that I, as the instructor, intended to give him an XF for the course.

Rita: I don't think I've EVER handled it appropriately. The first time it happened, and I've been teaching this class for [mentions how many] years, I shared this with the ombudsperson for students. So I shared it with [this person] and we decided I would bring it up with the students and give them a zero and then just put it in their files, the information that this occurred. So that's what I did. And, subsequently I've done that until last semester. I don't know why. Either I was too busy or overwhelmed or whatever, but I called the students in

EST COPY AVAILABLE

> (Comments continued.)
> collectively and they acted up. I've always said something to students all along the way that this was cheating. And for the most part they don't assume that it's cheating. They think that because I didn't SAY. and I always say this. or since that time I've put it in my syllabus. 'Individual work unless otherwise noted.' But if I didn't say it out loud before the assignment. they don't assume that's cheating. And I explain to them. 'Yes it is because it wasn't on their own and it looked exactly the same.' That's what got me. So then this last semester. I just said something to the students collectively and they acted like they couldn't believe it. that I would say that it was cheating and give me an example. And then one cut me short and realized. yes. they had been cheating. And. I said if it happens again. it's a zero. So then. on later assignments. or more recently. I put the Honor Code on the assignments. I put the Honor Code on the final. And I put the Honor Code. of course. on my syllabus. so that's how I've handled it.
>
> **Nan:** And in most cases. I worked out a deal with the students that they would have to rewrite the paper and then I would regrade it. If it passed. then we would agree on a grade. That worked out fine in most cases. I never failed a student for the course. for plagiarizing. [Upon reflection in a member check. Nan said this was not quite true. that she had failed a few.] This is my cynical attitude—if a student has to plagiarize on a major project. they're not doing well on their other stuff either. (Laughter) As a result. I can usually fail them for the course. not on the basis of plagiarism necessarily. but on the basis of other things.

As with survey respondents. interviewed faculty reported using a variety of sanctions. It is in the narrative that I realized the struggle some faculty went through in deciding what to do about the cheating. the struggle in balancing what is fair to the students and fair to themselves as the instructors.

Respondents to the survey were able to note whether (a) they were aware of cheating. (b) they caught student misbehavior in large or small classes. and (c) they sanctioned students or not: they were *not* provided a means to adequately note the feelings they experienced in an incident of student cheating. With survey faculty who volunteered to an interview. I expressly asked a question on that very topic. My presumption was that addressing academic dishonesty with students is not easy and actually leaves faculty feeling vulnerable about their courses of action during the whole episode. It was not only interesting to hear what faculty had to say about their students' reactions in the first category; it was telling to see in their faces the emotions that also accompanied the telling. For some faculty, there was utter disbelief that a student would think the instructor "so stupid, so naive," as one faculty member put it. For others, traces of resentment and cynicism hung on their words. Still others could not belie the hurt and disappointment in their voices. This was especially true for faculty who saw themselves as caring and dedicated educators. In a small number, I also sensed anger and personal affront. One faculty made a face when he commented,

> **Robby**: Sure, yeah. So, it really does hurt everybody, whether they're in that class of not, and I think that it also hurts the faculty member. You know, here you have a situation where you have someone that's essentially trying to beat the system, as it were, and I see that as a direct, I don't know, attack is probably too strong of a word, on the faculty member who is basically, you know, um, I as the faculty member am the one they are trying to beat, get around, whatever. So, you know, to a certain extent, I take it personally.

Some interviewed and focus group faculty discussed how individual cheating episodes affected them, even a couple of years later. The following faculty comments show the gamut of feelings expressed by faculty after dealing with such student behavior:

> **Beth:** I asked her about it and I swear these issues are harder for us than it is for the students sometimes. Yeah, oh gosh, I was a basket case to tell the truth. Calling attention to it is not the most pleasant thing and at that point, I'm a junior faculty member here, I thought well 'I can't prove this,' that's all I can do with it. And that blew me away. I guess what it comes down to is it amazes me that they assume they're not going to get caught.

> **Dick:** Well, it's frustrating. You just (pause), you have such, I don't know, in teaching, you want your students to do well and when the students do well, you feel good and when the students don't do well you feel bad because you're trying to, my goal is to get as much information, as much knowledge passed from me to the students for them to learn as much possible and when you see somebody sort of short circuiting the system and trying to get around it. Grading is the least fun part of what I do. I mean, teaching would really be fun if we didn't have to worry about grades. But I know it's a motivating factor and if I didn't....If I said, 'Well, everybody's going to get an A.' I know I wouldn't have very many people

ST COPY AVAILABL

in the seats probably, so then, that's unfortunate, but that's the way it is. When you come across something, you're surprised first, and then, you're not sure. Am I, am I, cause that's a big statement. That's a big accusation to make to say, 'I think you cheated.' So you want to be sure. There's been two or three since then that I've suspected it, but I just, you know. As I evaluate the evidence, well, it's really a gray area.... Oh yeah, it's just very unnerving and it's just a whole other layer of stress.

Sandi: I'm not, I...don't know how to say this. I think that mostly the kids are more or less honest, but I think the more or less is the tricky part. The ones that really trouble me and I think that there's very little that can be done about them. The ones that are more or less honest I think that if you tell them the Honor Code thing, you know, and I think that they'll really try. There's a certain group though, that are so enamored of the entitlement notion of things that they may view getting away with something as a game. And that sounds very cynical, but I'm getting very old now and I don't assume that all of them are sweet cherubs just off the farm anymore.

Jesse: It is time consuming and it is emotionally demanding because the student immediately becomes very defensive and often somewhat abusive. Well, it, the first feeling I get when I know something like this is 'ohhh, noooo' (makes a face). I just feel sick about it and ah, and then, well, gonna face up to it, and then investigate it...Yeah. It HURTS. As I said, I haven't really spent a long time talking with other professors, but I, the statistics tell me that other people are just not noticing things the way I have been because I end up with more of these than my fellows. And, I, one of the things that I like about the Honor thing is it removes the necessity of me being Solomon. I can present the case and say, 'I know wrong was done, but I'm not going to be the judge and the jury.'

Ken: Well, why I would say disgust more than anything else, ah, I abhor cheating, as I've indicated. This class is a class that is... if the students will simply attend, pay a reasonable amount of attention, and put forth a bit of effort, they should NOT have any difficulty passing this course. It's an introductory, survey-type course. It's just NOT, you know, a rigorous class on the order of something like Chemistry or Physics or math or something like that. You know I was just disgusted that the young man felt like he had to cheat in order to get through my class.

Leo: Well, really sad feeling that the student has really hurt himself much more than he knows by doing this initially. Just terrible disappointment. Both my TA and myself, not crying, but pretty sad for this kid to say. This is really too bad.
Helene: Any other feelings besides, you know, disappointment and sadness?
Leo: Well, concern. In terms of these questions of making the Honor System known to the students, I do all of those things in terms of the syllabus, whether it's printed or on the web, referring to it, referring to the...But one of those

> (Comments continued.)
> questions, you know, another feeling I would have in this whole process would be the um, (pause), the bit of ambivalence about making an issue here. Is it worth it? Um, for the hassle it's going to cause. It's important for the student, but I wouldn't want to be known on the campus as somebody who is an enforcer of this business. I don't need eggs on my door or other stuff happening.
>
> **Lucy:** And then, I was, I felt all kinds of things. I felt betrayed. I felt taken advantaged of. I felt frustrated. I felt angry. I felt REALLY angry because it was taking a lot of my time. And, not knowing if I handled it right. And actually, now, looking back, I probably should have been harder on them. But, what I did, I was really angry and grades were due at the end of the week. All this, I mean, granted I turned the grades in, but this bothered me for a long time.... wrote this, and they can see their files. So, I'm thinking why am I more at, now I was probably so frustrated and burned out after that situation. See, I'm mad and I'm embarrassed about this. I don't even think I turned in their names to him. Part of that was I promised them confidentiality...It IS and you know to this day, I pretty much am still emotional, I mean it happened a year ago.
>
> **Marion:** Oh my! Well, one you're immediately disappointed in the student for whom you had a higher regard, that this would be a student who tried to shortcut the amount of work expected by copying somebody else's work. Ah….(long pause).
>
> **Nan:** Well, it's irritation primarily for me because I, I always feel like the student is treating me like an idiot. Yah, and well that's the kind of stupidity that really, as I said, it's irritating more than anything else. I resent it as well. They're asking me to believe something that I know is not true...Um, it's, it's just, I also have a certain amount of cynicism.

I also witnessed some faculty laughing and wondered if humor was used as a way to conceal hurt or anger or possibly as a way to emotionally deal after-the-fact with these episodes. A couple of examples follow:

> **Josh:** As I tell my students this, 'That I've been here 29 years and if you think I don't know the difference (laughter)...I said 'I'm stupid, but I'm not dumb.'...Also I said, 'You may be a computer whiz, but I'm better than you. I've got every search engine and all search engines and I'll sit here for two weeks and let them run and I'll find it. Now, that's bold. (Lots of laughter)
>
> **Sandi:** One time in this course, I caught a kid (laughs) with pile of notes, right during a midterm, and I took his test and told him to go away and I gave him a zero and he never said a word.

> (Comments continued.)
> **Nan:** That one was easy. (Laughter) But, ah, when I, there are many cases I know that the student has plagiarized, but there's no way of finding the sources, or of bringing it home to the student, and in those cases, although I know it happened, I don't necessarily do anything about it.

Faculty admitted to a range of feelings when dealing with students who cheated and violated the Honor Pledge. Some faculty felt disappointment and sadness for the student involved; other faculty experienced anger at the student act of being dishonest, but also anger with the time commitment in adjudicating misbehavior. Some, such as Nan, expressed the cynicism she now feels when dealing with such cases, the resentment in how students are perceived as thinking faculty as 'idiots' and 'stupid' as well as 'naive' about what is happening in their classes.

Detecting Episodes of Student Cheating

During the course of conducting survey faculty interviews and focus groups, I heard comments about the difficulty some faculty members had in detecting cheating. For some, this difficulty is due to the large class enrollment in a course where a test is being given. Two examples include:

> **Kendra:** For the first 12 years that I was here, I taught [names course] in a big room, a course of about 200 to 300 students. And at one point we had as many as 400 students. It was really hard to monitor cheating in the exams. But what I can say is that I never...it was really hard for me to catch someone cheating, even with graduate students helping. It was really hard to catch them, but I did have a student come up at the end of one of my exams and told me he saw that one of the students cheating. And I watched him. I didn't see it, so I guess what I have to say is that it's really hard to catch students cheating in very large lecture rooms.

> **Ken:** It's essentially a large lecture class. It usually runs about 75 to 80 students in it. It's held in [names a large classroom on campus], which has a capacity of 80 students, so there's no room to spread the students out during exams. The seating is fixed with the writing tablet and all, so really rather difficult to prevent wandering eyes [and in essence detect cheating].

For other faculty, the difficulty in detecting cheating is due to the ease with which students now copy each other's assignments using electronic means:

> **Lucy:** [Giving an imaginary answer from a student as to how they did their assignment.] 'And then we all typed them and then we emailed them to each other and then we pasted them together and there's my paper.'
>
> **Randy:** So, but you can see how it becomes difficult to um...to draw a line. You can get two identical copies that were clearly made by electronically copying one from another. Well you can tell there's something wrong here. (Laughter). But sometimes it can be difficult.
>
> **Beth:** College kids I see, the chances of catching them... Again, because we're not traffic cops, we're not cops. The chances of catching them, particularly with the Internet. Technology has done a wonderful thing for us, but it's also done us a huge disservice in that all of this data's available and the chances of being able to actually prove that somebody's plagiarized or taken material that's not their own is, is just so slim.

The difficulties faculty had in the above two instances were attributable to not being able to tell which student did the original assignment and which student copied. For some faculty it was difficult to detect when students, having access to previously used assignments and projects, had turned those assignments in as academically original pieces of work, as these examples suggest:

> **Sam:** We have a class once a year and they have to do article reviews, so we've had them do article reviews as long as I've been team teaching that class. A few instances like that when I suspected it, but I could never prove it. Probably a lot of the main reasons is because ah..probably from semesters before. So, my suspicion is that upper classmen might be sharing their article reviews with the underclassmen. And because sometimes they seem familiar, but I don't...They are the same articles because there aren't many of them to choose from that are recent.. But since I don't have the original...because I hand it back to the students, it's difficult to know for sure.
>
> **Martha:** And sometimes I do get papers where I think, 'It does look like at first the two people each wrote it themselves, but there's so much overlap and you get these judgment calls.

ST COPY AVAILABL

Knowing when a student had cheated was not easy for some faculty to detect, especially in large class testing situations, electronically copied work, and instances of unauthorized use of others' assignments. Sometimes, faculty found detection absurdly easy, as in the following examples:

> **Beth:** I found a verbatim profile of the web site that one of the students had literally copied and pasted on to her analysis and it was a substantive portion. It was many, many inches of copy in her story, in her analysis.
>
> **Dick:** I think it was my page, ah, I noticed that she had the exact right numbers for the wrong problem, you know, and so, that, of course, threw out suspicion. I started looking, you know, trying to think how in the world could...is there any other way, you know? You always...I always try.
>
> **Dave:** It was...there were whole sections of it that were clearly not in his language.
>
> **Dennis:** There's a lot of files out there, but the equipment in this place does move around quite a bit. If we find something in the flow that wasn't there when the assignment was made, we call it a 'ghost' and it gets a zero. And, after..for a while, you know, they discover that it's a lot more work to copy and then have to go out and check every little thing to make sure you got it in the right place, because less is taken off if you leave something out, but if you put something in that we know was taken out a year before, then it's...you've got a file, and it's hard on them.
>
> **Jacob:** He never came to class, but he came to class one day to take a test in [names class], and looked over at the girl's paper who was sitting next to him and started copying down her formulas and problems. Unbeknownst to him, she was taking a [names a different course] test! And he copied all she wrote. Incredibly stupid!
>
> **Nan:** For instance, I had a student one time who turned in not only a paper, but the sources that he had used to plagiarize from. Um, that one was easy. (Laughter)

For some faculty, detecting dishonest acts can be nearly impossible, such as in giving tests in large auditorium-like classrooms where even proctors are employed. In other instances and circumstances, detection by faculty is certain and often anticipated.

–ST COPY AVAILABLE

Preventing Student Cheating

At this point, it is useful to discuss how some faculty attempted to discourage cheating behavior. For a few faculty, discussing methods they used to prevent cheating in their courses seemed appropriate. In the case of overall prevention, a couple of interviewed faculty felt that Honor System posters and the mention of the Honor Pledge and Honor System web site helped in prevention of dishonesty:

> **Dennis:**...[T]hey sent us all these posters, we have those posted and then we remind them of that. I don't put anything in my handouts about honesty because they know how I stand on it. But I know a lot of them in the department do put statements in theirs.
>
> **Leo:** I, in terms of these questions of making the Honor System known to the students, I do all of those things in terms of the syllabus, whether it's printed or on the web, referring to it, referring to the university's web pages in class, at the beginning of the semester going through the syllabus saying 'This is here for a purpose. I don't say on every project that you cannot cheat,' and so forth and so on, but every project involves, description and written concept statements. And I ask my students, I demand actually, that they acknowledge the sources that they might use as precedence for an idea. And I encourage them to use the book and refer to the book.

Another faculty member in a focus group felt it important to remind students about the consequences of cheating:

> **Martha:** I tell them at the beginning of the semester if they cheat I'll refer them to the Honor's Council and I tell them this last year's case I had is a guy who wanted a career in the military and everybody said, 'oops, that's going to be hard, if you get, what's it called?
> **Helene:** An XF on the transcript?
> **Josh:** Yes it is.
> **Martha:** Yes, an XF on his record, and I tell them 'think through your consequences.'

Using multiple versions of examinations and quizzes seems to be a common way faculty members try to prevent cheating, as evidenced by these comments:

> **Dick:** Because of the necessity and the closeness, I just, you know, I thought it was necessary to give alternate versions of the exams and so, as I always do, I

> (Comments continued.)
> make very similar problems, but often give different starting values for problems and that sort of thing. I'm always careful. I don't want to make one version harder than the other. I want them to be, you know, I don't do it to make a difference in students' grade [because of] which version they get. But I want to be able to detect if they're copying answers and that sort of thing.
>
> **Sandi:** I always make them [quizzes] open book because it doesn't help....They think it does, but it doesn't help. They still have to read it. And um...and open note. Now, I never give quizzes back and I never give out any test booklets back and I never...they get back an answer sheet and they get back their essay. I use multiple forms and sometimes you can still tell. We'll get the same answers on a side by side person, but that I don't even pay any attention to because they usually kill themselves if they do that because it's the wrong form that they're copying.
>
> **Ken:** So, what I've done, what I do, ah, the exams are scantron graded, so generally there are 50 questions, a combination of true/false and multiple choice. And what I do is I compose two versions of the exam that look almost identical. I simply rearrange the questions to where the length, the approximate length of the question, matches even though it's a different question. The same number of questions per page, that sort of thing. And I have the students sign their blank paper exam so that I can separate which exam they took. They don't know there are two versions. I don't color code them. I know a lot of instructors will color code them so the students know there are two exams. I don't see that that's my job to alert them that I'm trying to watch for cheating.
>
> **Marion:** On exams, you're always faced with the dilemma of previous exams, and I know my old exams are out there, so I operate on the premise that somebody or several people in the class have access to the previous year's exams, and I revise and shift, because what's there, what's important is whether or not they can handle the material when asked a different way. Now, I don't return the finals. At that point they don't care. I tell them that they can come back and see them in my office; they just can't keep them. But the question about what to do about unit exams, ah, and where do you, the exam should be a learning experience, but I return their exams because I want them to be able to use them to study for the final.

One faculty member could see both sides of the issue concerning the use of multiple versions of tests, whether these were used for large class enrollments or for multiple sections taught throughout the day:

> **Sam:** And I know I don't teach large sections and so when you have those many exams, but if you're going to do that...you know the way to do that is to have a

> (Comments continued.)
> different form of the exam for each administration, you know that's maybe impossible to do also, because there's only so many ways you can add so many questions about the content that you're talking about too, so it's a Catch-22 situation.

In talking to Larry, a faculty member I observed in one of the first-day-of-class sessions, I learned that he made students who take tests or quizzes before the rest of the class sign a piece of paper that they will not divulge what is on the quiz or exam. It seems this practice might remind students, who had taken an earlier test, of their responsibilities in not giving unauthorized aid to their peers. In another observation session, I heard Rupert explain that different versions of the make-up test and quizzes would be used and he would be using assigned seating during lectures and exams.

Other examples of preventing student dishonesty in academic work include faculty using techniques such as the following:

> **Sam:** So, I now have them attach a copy of the article with their [names assignment] so I can take a look at it, scan the article and see if they are quoting exact information out of the article.
>
> **Jesse:** More than once I've caught students who were changing the answers after the test was handed back, and by Xeroxing present them with 'this isn't what was given to you.' That requires a little bit of effort, and I think a lot of people just don't want to do it because it is, you know, it isn't fun. And I maybe a little unusual, although there are lots of others, I require the students to write the Pledge on their exams, write and sign it. And, I like to think that actually having them write it out and sign it over and over again, starts to sink in that we're really serious about this.
>
> **Jacob:** At the beginning of the semester we emphasize the Honor System by collaborating with the Speech Department. The students in Drama put on an improvisation—a skit where two students hand in the same [names typical assignment given in discipline] assignment. The actors are students and it becomes deathly silent when they are through with the skit.
>
> **Dave:** The reason that I always ask them to turn in a rough draft is so that I can catch things like this [plagiarism] immediately, get them in here, and we go

> (Comments continued.)
> through and, and, then, you know, they go back and do the research again and turn in a final document that's documented correctly.

For one focus group faculty participant, KSU faculty are part of the front line in preventing cheating episodes. He explained what he believed in faculty prevention in relation to the 1994 Principles of Biology cheating episode:

> **Sam:** ...I guess I go back to my high school teaching experience in that I create instances where it's easy for students to cheat if I want to. And if I don't, I mean, if I...if I'm not really smart about how I go about things, I'm going to put them in situations where they're tempted. And so, I guess in knowing that, I need to think about what kinds of assignments am I doing, what kind of things am I having them do. Am I in fact putting them in situations where it's going to be easy for them to choose to do that? I think we can choose activities [and] assignments that don't enable them to be tempted to do this, to make those choices. I think it's a two-way street. I was on faculty Senate back when we had the biology [incident]. You know, I mean, come on folks. You throw the stuff in the box and it's accessible to everybody from the first labs to the last ones, you know. Come on, that's like, putting the fox in charge of the chicken house. It's going to happen. Now should it? No. Should they know better not to do that? Sure, but in that case, the behavior encouraged the outcome that was there.

Finally, one faculty member alluded to the fact that college is not the only place prevention of academic dishonesty, specifically plagiarism, needs to be addressed; but expanding on that thread is not in the scope of this dissertation.

> **Nan:** I think ultimately it's going to take some changing of high school education as well, and that's very difficult.

Summary

In this section, I gave voice to both focus group faculty and faculty who agreed to an individual interview to discuss their handling of a personal episode of student cheating in their courses. Four themes emerged from faculty dialogue. Faculty discussed a variety of student behaviors they considered to be academic dishonesty. Faculty also gave their perceptions of the reactions they encountered with students who had been confronted with dishonest behavior. The variety of sanctions given students included warnings on one end of the spectrum of sanctions to suspension on the other end. And, finally, faculty expressed a myriad of feelings as they progressed through each episode, from shock and anger to disappointment, sadness, and having a 'sick to my stomach' feeling. Faculty interviews and discussions within the two focus groups provided a rich context in which to explain faculty beliefs, opinions, and practices about dealing with academic dishonesty at the collegiate level.

Question 4: What Training or Orientation Have KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Had in Addressing Academic Dishonesty?

Self-reported Training and Orientation

Table 25 below indicates that 92 faculty (25.1%) reported they considered themselves as having received training or orientation. An overwhelming 261 (71.1%) reported they did not have training or orientation in addressing academic dishonesty issues. Fourteen faculty, or 3.8%, marked *no response* to the question item.

Table 25

Q-26 Faculty Self-reports on Receiving Training or Orientation on Cheating

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	92	25.1
No	261	71.1
No response	14	3.8

Note. n = 367.

From results of survey reporting and interview dialogues, most participating faculty believe it is in their purview to educate students about academic dishonesty and ethical judgment. Most faculty in the study disseminated information about cheating, either through verbal or written practices. How did faculty *learn* these practices and techniques? Items Q-26 and Q-27 in the campus-wide survey addressed this question. However, as evidenced in Tables 26 on the previous page and 27 below, the number of faculty members who reported receiving help on such an important teaching issue is very small.

Reported Types of Training and Orientation

If faculty answered *yes* in Item Q-26, they were then asked to continue to Item Q-27, where they marked as many options as applied. The options concerned the type of training or orientation in which they were involved and are shown below in Table 26.

Table 26

Q-27 Faculty Self-reports on Types of Orientation Received

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Workshop or Seminar	39	42.4
Faculty Handbook	41	44.6
Orientation	23	25.0
Other	27	29.3

Note. n = 92.

Of the 92 respondents reporting some type of training or orientation, 39 (30%) were instances of *attending a workshop or seminar*. Another 41 (31.5%) reported *reading university policy in the Faculty Handbook*. Twenty-three (17.7%) reported receiving information at *orientation-type events*. Faculty who used the opportunity to give other examples of training or orientation listed many activities that could be seen as orientation. Some of these activities are mentioned in the section below under the item response titled *other*.

When faculty members were given a fourth option to write in an event of their choosing for the *other* category, 27 faculty members wrote comments. Some comments include the following:

-College faculty meeting
-Other faculty discussions
-Discussion with administrators
-Speaker at department meeting
-Principles of College Teaching Course
-Teaching practicum
-When on med school faculty
-Presentation at Faculty Senate

Other comments included references to the KSU Honor System or its staff:

-Participation in developing Honor Council procedures
-KSU Honor website
-Honor Council orientation & experience
-Discussion with Honor System Director
-Member of Honor System came to class and spent 30 minutes talking about subject-(great information)

It is evident that some faculty at Kansas State University received departmental training or orientation in addressing academic dishonesty issues, however, that percentage may be small campus-wide. Additionally, participating faculty were not asked if training and orientation occurred on this campus.

As I listened to faculty voices in the focus groups and interviews, I heard some express doubts in their approaches to dealing with student cheating, especially if they had not received focused or specific training or orientation:

> **Beth:** ...which is *scary* and you know, we can't be traffic cops, especially with the Internet. [italics added.]

> **Lucy:** And I gave them an outline and *I thought I was doing the right thing* by saying, you know, I gave them some criteria, 'you have to have, you know, four sources, and you're able to use two of the sources that I've put on reserve for you.' [italics added.]

> **Dick:** So, then when you come across something, I mean, you're surprised first, and then, you know, and then, *then you're not sure*, you know? Am I, am I...because that's a big statement. That's a big accusation to make to say, you know, 'I think you cheated.' So you want to be sure.... Another one where they had an explanation, *I have doubts*, but I just didn't think it would stand up to scrutiny. I just didn't think the case was strong enough and so I sort of, you know, gave them a little lecture (chuckles) and sent them on their way. [italics added.]

Doubting what actions to take in handling cheating episodes led some faculty to consult with colleagues about what to do:

> **Dick:** I went to some of the faculty in our department that I kind of consider mentors in this and that, department head, others, not necessarily older, but more experienced faculty and said, 'Hey, you know, what would you do in this case?' And a lot of them said, 'Just call them in, lower their grade, and be done with it. Just don't drag this out because you're just creating more work than, you know, you're just making it hard on yourself, hard on the student.

> **Marion:** So, I debated about how to best handle it. I showed it, showed the two without the identification of who was which or what the circumstances had been and asked a couple of faculty to look at it and said, 'Do you think these are identical?' And, of course (chuckle), their answer was 'Yes, of course.' This one has so-and-so's name on.' Ah, and so the other one didn't.

With implementation of the KSU Undergraduate Honor System in fall 1999, faculty had another resource for gaining insight and practical advice on how to handle episodes of academic dishonesty. Just as a few survey faculty members reported contacting the Honor System staff, some interview faculty also used this avenue:

> **Leo:** At that point, I called Phil Anderson [Honor System Director] and the department head pretty much on the same day and said, 'Here's what's happened.

> (Comments continued.)
> **Dick:** [I] talked to Phil on the phone. One of the other faculty members in our department down the hall said we ought to just...a faculty senator said, 'You ought to call Phil Anderson [Honor System Director]. He'd be glad to talk to you about it. So, I talked to Phil about the situation and he kind of laid out what my options were, and so, then I called the student in.
>
> **Nan:** Phil Anderson [Honor System Director] was involved in it and I don't know how this will end up ultimately.

In lieu of formal orientation and training, participating faculty used a variety of methods to better educate themselves in dealing with cheating episodes. Doubt in what actions to take led some faculty to consult with colleagues, with department heads and chairs, and with the Honor System staff and web site.

Summary

In summary, a small percentage of study participants in both the campus-wide survey and individual interviews reported some training and orientation in addressing academic dishonesty. For some faculty, the orientation consisted of either University or departmental faculty meetings and discussions. Others consulted with the Faculty Handbook; a few met with their colleagues in one-on-one sessions. A very small minority of survey faculty received training or orientation in a workshop or seminar on the topic of cheating. The KSU Honor System staff and web site provided orientation for other faculty members who had the misfortune of having to deal with a student cheating episode. However, the majority of faculty members did not receive training or orientation on how to handle situations of student misconduct, much less information on how faculty members influence college students' moral judgment development through interactions within the scope of academic integrity.

Question 5: What Perspective Do KSU Participating Undergraduate Faculty Have Concerning Student Moral Development Issues Relating to Episodes of Academic Dishonesty?

Introduction

The answers to this important question were far more difficult to learn, due in part to the very definition of the term *student moral development*. In the campus-wide survey, four question items were posed to faculty about their opinions on (a) an instructor taking time to talk to a student who has cheated, (b) whether students guilty of cheating and sanctioned learn from the experience, (c) whether they agreed that once a cheater, always a cheater, and (d) whether part of an instructor's job is to help students learn ethical behavior. I categorized responding faculty as having a perspective of student moral development if they agreed or disagreed in a certain way with each of these statements. Specifically, I considered survey faculty as having a student development perspective if they indicated they agreed or strongly agreed with the statements in Items Q-15, Q-16, and Q-18. Alternately, I believed survey faculty to have the opinion that there is potential for student moral development if respondents reported disagreement or strong disagreement with the statement in Item Q-17, *once a cheater, always a cheater*.

I categorized faculty who participated in individual interviews and focus groups as having a student moral development perspective if certain criteria were met. If faculty verbalized they thought a student *learned* something from being caught cheating, I saw this as having a perspective, however vague, that college students are still developing in moral judgment. I also deemed faculty as having a perspective of student moral development if they verbalized an opinion that students *learned* something from the sanctions meted out for dishonest scholarly behavior. Similarly, I reported participants as having a student development perspective if they verbalized that students who engage in a discussion with an instructor following a cheating incident *learn* from the discussion. The following section reports the perspective faculty had of student development, specifically in moral judgment at the collegiate level.

Student Moral Development Opinions: Campus-wide Survey

Four items on the survey addressed the guiding question relating to faculty perspective of students' moral development in the college years. Faculty responses to item Q-15, whether faculty believe instructors should take time to talk with a student who has been found cheating, are reported in Table 27 below. Of 363 undergraduate teaching faculty respondents, an overwhelming majority, 97.8%, are of the opinion that faculty should take the time to have a discussion with a student when cheating is suspected.

Table 27

Q-15 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Discussing Cheating Episode with Students

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	253	70.0
Agree	101	27.8
Disagree	8	0.02
Strongly Disagree	1	0.01

Note. n = 363.

Five respondents did not indicate an option and left this item blank.

One comment written directly on the survey next to this item suggested that having a discussion with a student depended on the severity of the incident. Another respondent wrote in the margin, "generally to determine whether cheating was ignorance or done with malice." A very small number of faculty members either *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed* faculty have this responsibility. It may be that faculty who do not believe they should take the time to discuss cheating episodes with students may also believe, among other things, that students will not benefit from such a discussion. Not benefiting could be translated into not learning or developing moral judgment or decision-making skills.

Table 28 below reports responses to Item Q-16 where faculty indicated whether they *agreed* or *disagreed* that students guilty of cheating and sanctioned—given a penalty—learn from the experience. Of 333 respondents, 272 faculty members (81.7 %)

Table 28

Q-16 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Whether Students Learn From Sanctions

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	74	22.2
Agree	198	59.5
Disagree	61	18.3
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0

Note. n = 333.

ST COPY AVAILABL

responded they *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that students do learn from the experience. Another 18.3% reported they *disagreed* that students learn from the experience, but there were no faculty self-reporting that they *strongly disagreed* with this statement. Thirty-five respondents did not indicate an option and left this item blank.

Item Q-16 had the most qualitative comments written next to it. Of the twenty comments written, over half suggested having a middle category between agree and disagree. Some of the comments included:

> -Depends on student
> -Learned something, may not have learned not to cheat
> -Some are determined to cut corners anyway, some learn early to cut them more prudently, others are naïve and presumably, THEY will learn what they did not know before.
> -I honestly have no idea/I hope…no idea
> -Don't have any idea/Don't know
> -Would like to think so, but do wonder

Quite a few comments appeared in the form of circling both the terms *agree* and *disagree* as an effort to show that they might agree in some circumstances but not others.

From the reporting percentages of Item Q-15 on page 169 and Q-16 on page 170, it is my assumption that there is a small percentage of faculty members who have the opinion that instructors *should* take time to discuss episodes, but they are not sure students learn from being caught and punished. Faculty speculated when they said that students have learned new decision making skills after being involved in a cheating situation. Faculty also commented that they honestly did not know if students learned after having a discussion with an instructor. However, if faculty members believe that there may be a *possibility* that students learn something from the episode, having that belief may encourage faculty to make time for discussion.

Table 29 at the top of the following page notes responses to Item Q-17, a statement used to elicit faculty opinion about students' moral character in relation to a cheating incident. Of 299 respondents, 230 or 76.6% of survey faculty have the opinion that once a cheater, *not* always a cheater. On the other hand, 69 or 23.0% self-report that they believe once a cheater, always a cheater. My presupposition is that if faculty members believe that students who cheat will always be cheaters, then they may believe there is no need to help students make better decisions for the future. Some faculty may believe that students will not learn from their mistakes and will continue being academically dishonest.

Table 29

Q-17 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Whether a Cheater Is Always a Cheater

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	4	0.13
Agree	65	21.7
Disagree	229	76.6
Strongly Disagree	1	0.03

Note. n = 299.

For some faculty, *labeling a student a cheater* may be like assigning a personality trait to a student. Labels such as cheater refer to a student's character. On the other hand, faculty who say *a student has cheated* are really describing a behavior, divorcing the person from the act. In the latter instance, faculty may believe that a student can change his or her behavior much more easily than changing his or her character or personality.

Another 69 did not respond to Item Q-17. As with other items in the survey, some faculty also wrote comments next to the item. The following are examples of comments written:

> -Often
> -Unless there are significant penalties, then disagree
> -Unless they have a change of heart, usually from a religious conversion or conviction
> -Again, two classes-those who cheat deliberately, who have insufficiently developed or sincere, and those who are naïve

As with Item Q-16, a few faculty wrote that they wanted a response category for 'don't know' or an in-between response. Some faculty also wrote they wanted to circle both agree and disagree depending on circumstances.

The last statement on the survey addressing student moral development is Item Q-18, a declarative statement in whic faculty are asked to give an opinion on whether faculty have a role in helping students learn ethical behavior. Table 30 on the top of the following page reports an overwhelming 91.1%, or 328 faculty responding that they agree or strongly agree with the statement that it is part of their job to help students learn ethical behavior. Thirty-two respondents (8.9%) disagreed with this statement and 8 faculty did not respond to the item. Again, as with Item Q-16, there were no faculty members self-reporting that they strongly disagreed with the statement.

Table 30

Q-18 Faculty Self-reported Opinions on Teaching Students Ethical Behavior

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	161	44.7
Agree	167	46.4
Disagree	32	8.9
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0

Note. n = 360.

Only two faculty members wrote a comment next to this item on the survey. One respondent wrote that this question held too many assumptions and the other comment simply stated, "not about this stuff." *This stuff*, in the context of academic dishonesty, refers to development of students' ethical decision-making and responsibility to the campus community.

To further investigate the construct *faculty student development perspective* I conducted tests on the same four questions, Q-15 through Q-18, using the SAS computer analysis program. First, simple statistics such as the mean and standard deviation were reported on the four questions, as shown in Table 31 on the following page. Simple statistics were taken on only those respondents who answered three out of the four survey items Q-15 through Q-18.

Table 31

Mean and Standard Deviation for Survey Items Q-15 through Q-18

Survey Items	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Q-15	346	3.67	0.52
Q-16	330	3.04	0.63
Q-17	298	2.76	0.47
Q-18	343	3.36	0.64

Table 31 above suggests that Item Q-15 had more agreement among participants: more faculty reported they *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that an instructor should take time to discuss a cheating episode with students. Less agreement among faculty was found with Item Q-18 where faculty reported they *agreed* or *strongly agreed* part of the instructor's job is to help students learn ethical behavior. Likewise, faculty reported even less agreement, although still the majority in the *agreed* or *strongly agreed* categories. Item Q-17 results indicate that the majority of participants reported *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed* with the statement that once a cheater, always a cheater.

In order to provide a stronger case for the validation of a construct entitled *faculty student development perspective*, I solicited the advice of Spector (1992). He reported the benefits of constructing a summated rating scale using a list of item responces. I conducted an item analysis to reveal the degree of internal consistency between Items Q-15 through Q-18 with hopes of constructing such a scale. I computed a Cronbach coefficient alpha on the four items. I wanted a measure of relatedness to validate my presupposition that these four items would give a measure of each respondent's *student development perspective*. As explained previously, giving a positive answer to three items (Q-15, Q-16, and Q-18) and a negative answer to one (Q-17) faculty members would give an indication if they believed students might learn from faculty/student interaction after cheating.

Table 32 below indicates, however, that the evidence does not exist to demonstrate this construct. The obtained Cronbach coefficient alpha of 0.12 indicates that the four items were not converging on a common attribute. Table 32 presents the intercorrelations among the four items and the alphas with each item successively deleted.

Table 32

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha with Deleted Item (n = 298)

Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total	Alpha
Q-15	0.08	0.06
Q-16	0.00	0.18
Q-17	0.05	0.11
Q-18	0.10	0.02

The Pearson correlation coefficients among Q-15 through Q-18 in Table 33 on the top of the following page further suggest that there is insufficient evidence to claim, with this particlar set of data, a measurement of *faculty student development perspective*.

Table 33

Pearson Correlation Coefficients (n = 298)

	Q-15	Q-16	Q-17	Q-18
Q-15	--	-0.01	0.00	0.13*
Q-16		--	0.02	-0.00
Q-17			--	0.05
Q-18				--

*Significant at .05 level.

Student Moral Development Opinions: Observations, Interviews, and Focus Groups

Of the 16 first-day classrooms observed within the four semesters of the study, I heard only one faculty member verbalize his hope that students in his class would develop in ethical decision-making skills for their future profession:

> **Tracy:** My teaching philosophy is based on trust and respect. I will come prepared and will challenge you to think. You can earn my trust by discussing responsibly and thinking more. I will excite, confuse, challenge, and celebrate you. My goal for the class is to have you believe that how you live your life is more important than your livelihood.

This same faculty member also furnished students an objective in the course syllabus that stated: *possess a basic understanding of* [names discipline] *ethics and be able to employ this understanding in the formation of a personal set of* [names discipline] *ethics.*

Faculty who participated in focus groups and individual interviews also commented about student moral development as regards dishonest academic behavior. I asked all faculty I interviewed if they believed that students are still evolving in their moral decision making when they come to college. I asked this question to find out if facuty would articulate further on this opinion.

> **Jesse:** Oh yes, absolutely! Absolutely. Ah, you know, I mean, if they were already completely set in their ways, why, of course there would be no point in this [going through the Honor System to adjudicate students who were caught cheating] and you'd be a game of cops and robbers, pure and simple.
>
> **Sandi:** If we believe that there is a place here for significant intellectual development, I know...I'm a little mystified as to why we don't think that there's room for significant moral development as well as ethical development.
>
> **Dick:** Ah, I think they have an idea of, you know.... I think they understand what cheating is, but I don't know that they have a, you know, they're at a point in their lives where they are developing their ethics, their values, all that sort of thing, other than what they got from their parents. I think they're more accepting of it. I think there's a perception that everybody does it, that it goes on a lot. And, and it goes on as I'm finding, you know, more than I might have suspected.

Of the three faculty expressing their thoughts in the above comments, Dick seems to be articulating best the student development perspective. Students in college are in the process of developing their own set of values, one of which includes integrity. Students, until this time in their lives, have relied on parents and other authority figures to guide their decisions. For some students, this is the first time away from parental involvement. Especially in the first two years, it is important that there is continued dialogue about values. Students away from home are more autonomous and will experiment with beliefs and values. Students' mastery of the developmental task involving the attainment of integrity still requires exposure to dialogue and modeling.

For some faculty, *student learning* comes in the form of fear or frustration with being caught, as the following comments indicate:

> **Helene:** So, I'll reiterate a question I had in my survey, 'Do you think students learn from being caught and then talking about it?'
> **Marian:** Well, it sure put shivers down through the kids who were here

> at the time of the girl [who cheated and was found out], when that case went to the Dean.
>
> **Helene:** You mention, personality. Do you think this is something learned or do you think that this is something...that does not change?
> **Lucy:** Um, that's a good question. You know, I guess, and maybe it's the optimist in me, I guess I want to say it's learned and that it can change. I mean, I honestly believe the three [students] that came in, for sure two of the three that came in, it had a huge impact on them. They were finally caught, someone said something to them, and they left here in tears.
>
> **Robby:** And I'm not so sure that they're sorry they've cheated as much as they're sorry they got caught, you know....[T]hey were sorry they got caught. They were mad they got caught. I was the bad guy because I caught them.

Fear of being caught is an appropriate response from students who may still be reasoning at Kolhberg's preconventional level. For another faculty member, a student who comes back to talk about an episode shows growth:

> **Dave:** I hope that's the case. I don't know. I never heard back from him. And that has worried me some. But I did hear from another advisor on campus, a person who does know him, and she said that he felt, he is going to come back and talk to me about it, after he, you know, takes a year or so to think about it some more [student went to an internship], that he really did appreciate it [being caught and having a discussion about integrity, especially for the profession].

When I inquired whether they believed it was part of faculty's job to teach ethical decision-making and ethical reasoning skills, one faculty thought it better to get the message [making ethical decisions] across to students through classes, that certain classes were appropriate for this task:

> **Helene:** And, do you consider it your role, um, and I alluded to that, in here [holds up copy of survey]?
> **Robby:** [C]ertain classes, I think, lend themselves more to that than others. I think that within [names college], we do try to teach them to treat people with respect and fairness... and certainly in those courses, ah, primarily driven by law, there are certain requirements about how people should and should not be treated, okay? But, I think we tend to focus on the legalistic level.
> **Helene:** That three and four [Kohlbergian] level?
> **Robby:** As opposed to the higher levels of doing it because it's the right thing to do.

ST COPY AVAILABL

> **Helene:** The aspirational level.
> **Robby:** Um, I think that it's something that they...critical thinking and ethical decision making are both courses that I think...they're not offered and they should be. (Pause). I do not see people making wise decisions. And not just in regard to cheating, but in regard to a lot of things around this campus. Where I came from they had those types of courses and they were required.

Indirectly offering an opinion of agreement that it *is* in the role of faculty to help students learn ethical behavior, a few faculty members spoke of helping students make better ethical decisions [develop in moral judgment] through the curricula or through discussions. One offered that it is more than the job of faculty; it is a *duty*:

> **Kendra:** Now that we're talking about student development, sometimes I feel that they are in 'no man's land' and you really have to think about ethics and doing things because students don't think it's wrong to right-click on an image on the web page and take it and put it on their own web page. They don't realize...they think it's free, you know, it's free to download. And what you have to do is tell them, 'No, that belongs to somebody and unless you're buying a clip art collection that gives you permission to do that, you can't just take a cartoon of Garfield and take it off their page.' So you have to tell them that. I find that I have to tell students the ethics of what they did and what's wrong.

Another faculty used the analogy of calling pitches in a baseball game to teaching students with each indiscretion that occurs:

> **Kirby:** [W]hen you ask a student, 'Does this behavior or that behavior have integrity or not,' then it's really appropriate for the student to jump up and say, 'I should ask. Are there any conflicts of interests in this?' And some people who first become aware of conflict of interest are not aware that it's possible to operate in an environment as long as there's full informed participation that way. And that people understand what the potential conflict is that you make scrupulous effort to avoid the conflict and acting on the interest as opposed to acting on the broad integrity or the truth of the issue. I think we ought to call every pitch. That is, in the baseball game there are no free pitches and no gimmes. Baseball is designed so you've got multiple chances at swinging the bat...a chance to have a strike, to have a foul ball and nobody says anything about your mother, your genetic disposition, your heritage, whatever. You get to try several times. And, if you get three strikes, then you go sit down and wait for your turn to come back again. And, I think we've been told that tolerance is a good thing, you know, ignore minor transgressions. And, what could be more minor than somebody merely tossing a ball to you in play and it being, and you missed it. That's a strike, but it's called a strike and now you know where the strike zone is.

> **Helene:** Right, the boundaries?
> **Kirby:** The boundaries. And I think that probably what happens...leads to tolerance, tolerance, tolerance...straw-that-breaks-the-camel's-back, and suddenly there is (hits hands together) retribution because somebody's not going to tolerate anymore what has been tolerated for too long.
> **Helene:** Without dialogue?
> **Kirby:** Without dialogue or without set boundaries or whatever else and so, whether we're talking about personnel management or classroom behavior management or anything else, I'm likely to say to the student, 'You know it makes me nervous when you do that because... or, a lot of people would consider that inappropriate, but consider it a free strike.' But there is no such thing as a free strike, but you have a strike. I'm not sending you out of the class, you don't have to go sit down yet, but....But, learn from this. So the next time that you do that, that's not going to be acceptable. And if you do it again, well you may have to leave.

Thinking back to an episode when he himself had been caught cheating, one faculty member believed his own development to be testament for faculty's intervention:

> **Dick:** I was a part of a deal with a large, almost a scandalous kind of a, you know, a 15-student kind of a thing. I was in 2nd hour history and I stole an extra copy of the exam out for somebody in 5th hour history. You know, [I] had to write a term paper on integrity and all that sort of thing. I think it ended up being on, mine because it was history, I had to write about Watergate, which was kind of appropriate. Yeah, you know it really did make me think, not just the fear of what would happen, but just about what had I done. You know, is this the kind of person I want to be? Is this the way I want to conduct myself?

Another faculty interviewee expressed his concern that faculty have the resources available to help students learn within the context of making mistakes, especially in cases of plagiarism. The following comments illustrate a faculty member's opinion that students can learn after making unwise decisions in their academic work:

> **Dave:** I think this is a really important issue for the university and I want to make sure that, you know, that we provide all the resources possible to both students and faculty to make sure that things like this [cheating or plagiarism] are corrected at the appropriate moment and become part of their educational experience.

When faculty discuss ethical issues with students or take class time to model what is acceptable and ethical behavior, it is evident faculty believe students at the college level are still developing in moral judgment.

More than one participant member spoke of the *lack* of students' ethical development in terms of what they, faculty, believe to be the consumer mentality currently being promoted in academia:

> **Lucy:** You know, (pause)...I see more students today that don't take responsibility than I did in the past. I think that students today tend to put more blame, tend to do the victim thing more. I think, I tend to think of them, not all, but I think of them sometimes as more spoiled. I think that they feel like they're paying, they're coming to college and they're paying for it, and if the teacher doesn't write down how many pages the assignment has to be [then it's the instructor's fault if the student doesn't do the right thing].
>
> **Sandi:** There's a certain group though, that are so enamored of the entitlement notion of things that they may view getting away with something as a game. And that sounds very cynical, but I'm getting very old now and I don't assume that all of them are sweet cherubs just off the farm anymore.
>
> **Kirby:** I have a great dissatisfaction with the movement towards consumer satisfaction as the basis for education. Um, there are a lot of students who think that they paid their money, and they came into the classroom and it's the instructor's job to put the neatly wrapped package on their table. They get to try it on and decide how much they like. And, they get to decide whether or not they want to take, you know, a B's worth of it or a C's worth of it, you know, or whatever else they want. And they don't look at the educational process as a collaborative joint venture between the instructor and the student and that BOTH of us have intent with enhancing our missions....In trying to do that, we're not sales venders if we're doing our education. And I don't think that a program that merely seeks to identify and punish cheaters, ah, solves this consumer satisfaction problem. I get better feedback from students who have been out of class for some time than from those who are currently in class. And after 25 years, I've become convinced that I don't have to please them, necessarily.
>
> **Robby:** It's a consumer mentality....And I have a problem with the entire system that creates an environment where a student envisions, (a) that he or she has a *right* to a diploma—'I'm paying my money and therefore I'm going to *get* my degree'—and, (b) that they are, and Wefald and Coffman have both come out and said publicly that they [students] are consumers. That we are providing a service to them. But what they do not understand is the very essence of service marketing.

> Case in point, a physician. You go to a physician and it's the physician's responsibility to do what's *right* regardless of what you *want*. And that is the level at which we should operate, but not at the level which they [students] understand. They understand a basic consumer mentality of going to a convenience store where 'I give my money, I get my product' without any thought to, I mean, that's a product market as opposed to a service market. And they can't see the difference.
> **Helene:** Because the students see that diploma as a product?
> **Robby:** Exactly, right. But so is good health when you go to a physician if you want to look at it in that sense....[T]he provider also has a duty to advise the person to take the right actions, to tell people. I mean for a physician, 'Don't smoke. Exercise. Do this; don't do that.' You go to a financial advisor. He or she has the right, or the obligation to tell you, you know, 'Divest, buy, don't do this, do that.' It may not be what you want to hear, but it's the thing that you are
> (Comments continued.)
> supposed to do. Now failure to follow the advice can result in a bad outcome. And that's the essence of service marketing. And they don't understand it that way. As long as it's presented as, as a product market, that we're going to have this problem. And, I think that it's absolutely inappropriate, and from my perspective as a faculty member, it's intolerable that a student would behave in that fashion. I mean, the level of disrespect that I have found here, ah, is atrocious. The level of student apathy is atrocious. And I think that is a big part of the reason why you end up seeing more cheating, is the idea that 'I don't have to work. I'm entitled somehow.'

If some participating faculty perceived that students misunderstand the reasons for attaining an education, then there may be more K-State faculty with these very same frustrations—beliefs that academically dishonest students do not understand why they are in college in the first place.

Rest (1994) pointed out that developing moral judgment in ethical situations occurs when a person contemplates how his or her action will affect others involved in that dilemma. Some faculty members who were interviewed were able to express how cheating affects others, and not just the cheater. Students who are developing in integrity learn to do the same when the behavior is modeled. One faculty, in particular, talked through his perception of who is impacted by an academically dishonest act:

> **Robby:** Well, I guess, that I look at academic integrity from a couple of viewpoints. First, I guess, at the most basic level it bothers me that a student is too lazy to do his or her own work. And it may not be laziness, as much as fear of not being able to do it well. I mean there's probably a variety of things that lead to it beyond laziness. So, that part bothers me. But then, I guess the repercussions...I don't think that they give full thought to who all it impacts. So, it impacts, obviously themselves for a variety of reasons. I mean, not the least of which is they know they've done something wrong and so that's the bottom one. But there's also the idea, I guess that if they get away with this, then maybe they'll be tempted to do it again, or do even bigger (pause) a slippery slope type of thing. On the part of the other people, I mean, obviously it's going to impact the other students. I mean if you have other students that are working and studying and doing what they're supposed to do, then certainly it's not fair to them that one person is able to get as good, or maybe even a better grade without having to do the work at all. Ah, (pause), it definitely will, has the potential, to, you know, (Comments continued.)
> skew averages in classes. I don't think it's fair to the students of the university in general, whether they are in the class or not, because if this person is getting a degree from, in this instance KSU, and they go out and they do not really know what they're doing, then it's going to hurt the reputation of the university. And so what it does, in essence, is cheapen the value the degree from that university.

Students learn to become more ethical when faculty express moral sensitivity through dialogue, whether in class discussions or discussions with students who have been less than ethical in academic work (Kohlburg, 1985). One faculty framed this sensitivity in his discussion of teacher evaluations:

> **Kirby:** I'm not worried about anybody suggesting how to improve. I've always evaluated all of my courses, but some students, rather than saying, 'I would like to see this added to the course.' Or 'This seemed like it came too early.' Or 'We didn't have enough time for that.' They just say, you know, make spurious comments, either about the instructor or about the course, without any judgment of why or how to improve. See, I consider *that* lack of integrity. That won't show up as cheating. Is that cheating? It's cheating themselves, it's cheating the system, but it's not 'cheating.' It's not breaking the rules. Course evaluation is where you get to 'give the instructor what he deserves, the ole rascal who made life tough for you.'
> **Helene:** But you're right, five years down the way, they'll come back to you and say they learned from you, but at the point that they are now, they can't see that?
> **Kirby:** Right.
> **Helene:** Because they haven't grown yet?
> **Kirby:** Right. If they already knew what was right for them, they didn't need to be here.

If Kirby discusses his thoughts with students, there is a chance that some students will be receptive to his reasoning and begin to change their own thoughts about why they should be more ethical in filling out teacher evaluations. In other faculty discussions, the topic could revolve around the ethics of doing one's own work when assessment is involved. The topic would revolve around looking at cheating from more than one perspective, from the student alone to other students, to university, to society.

One qualitative comment from a survey faculty member leads me to believe that this person understood, even on a basic level, that students develop in moral judgment. When asked about taking time to discuss academic dishonesty, this person indicated that he did take time, but his time "varied with class level." Without the benefit of following up on his comment, I take this to say that it is more important or needed for me to discuss this issue with freshmen and sophomores, than juniors or seniors.

Messages to Students

Toward the end of the interview with faculty who volunteered to speak about an episode of student cheating, the question was asked, *If you had a message you wanted to give students about academic integrity, what would that message be?* Some faculty gave one-liners and others used the question to express more deeply their opinions about the lack of integrity *in community*—with faculty as well as students:

> **Jacob:** I think if I was to give a general message to students it would be that their integrity is their most important possession.
>
> **Nan:** Sooner or later it's going to come back around [cheating and dishonesty].
>
> **Beth:** Oh, to violate the rules of ethics follows you forever, regardless of whether or not you get caught. I can't stress it enough.
>
> **Ken:** Well, it certainly doesn't pay. When they graduate and they're on the job somewhere, there are no shortcuts, ah, so it just doesn't pay in the long run.

> **Dick:** Well, let me think about that (pause). You know there's the old saying about...integrity is about what you'd do if you knew you wouldn't be caught, or all that sort of thing. You know, I think it is more than just about grades. It is more than just about....part of the reason that we enforce this is so that we have equitable grades. It's not fair that one person does more work and the other doesn't even work and they get the same or even better grade, and that sort of thing. But it really does go beyond that. It's about, you know, [it] really does go beyond that. It's about yourself as a person. What kind of person are you?
>
> **Leo:** Um, be honest and demonstrate to others you're willing to acknowledge errors or poor judgment where you see it and that we are a community that needs to protect each other through, not only being true and being honest, but reporting others if we see transgressions. It's this community thing. And you steal or cheat on exams, and so...you're hurting everybody....I think we have to lead by example. I think if we're not honest and really demonstrating integrity, we don't have any business asking it of our students, and um, that's a problem in some cases....They do learn very quickly by example, and if they see unethical behavior in a faculty, that is terribly destructive [interviewee had just related frustration with faculty who do not teach basics needed in a prerequisite course].
>
> **Robby:** [After relating an episode where departmental faculty were making decisions in an unethical manner] The point is that when we have people at that level [names department] operating in the same way, what message does that send, then, to the students? I think that we, as faculty, need to serve as role models. We need to adopt and maintain the moral high ground ourselves, because we, I mean we don't like what's going on, but turning around and doing it to somebody else and, do you think that message isn't going to get out?

This same opinion—the necessity to include *community*, meaning both faculty and students, in Kansas State University's quest to enhance the climate of integrity—is verbalized by another faculty member in an interview session. The following faculty member's comments include faculty attitude and actions when he alludes to cultivating integrity:

> **Helene:** I'm, ah, I was concerned when we first started, um, about the Honor Program in your eyes, and I'm wondering how many others see it the same way.
> **Kirby:** Well, I didn't want to say that I don't have faith and trust in the Honor System. I just think that we need to continue to challenge ourselves, everybody, to seek integrity and ways to cultivate the proper. Oh 'proper' sounds like the official politically correct approved attitudes, but we need to cultivate [integrity].
> **Helene:** So, how are we going to do that?

> **Kirby:** Well, I don't know, but I think we have to recognize performance of things, of student action, or of faculty action that leads to behaviors and attitudes that exemplify high quality integrity as opposed to *freedom from cheating* [italics added].

It is interesting that Kirby, a faculty member, espoused in his last comment the intended mission of the Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System—to preserve integrity in the academic setting—through the Honor Pledge.

Faculty members who were interviewed in this study seemed to operate with a student development perspective. That is, they reported being of the opinion that students are still developing in personal areas such as identifying, personalizing, and humanizing their values. Specifically, faculty comments spoke to the fact that students at the collegiate level are still in the process of identifying their own values and how those values relate to ethical decision making. The degree and articulation of faculty perspective of students' moral judgment development varied from one faculty member to the next. Some participating faculty, in their comments, expressed this perspective in terms of their perceptions of student *behavior*, what students *do*—crying, pleading, apologizing, denying. Other faculty expressed perspective in terms of their perceptions of student *character* or *personality*, what students *are*—remorseful, angry to be caught, ashamed, in denial of having cheated. In summary, participating KSU faculty varied in their opinions about student development, specifically in moral judgment and decision-making. Faculty variance in opinions of student moral development translated into faculty variance in practices when addressing personal episodes of student cheating. For some faculty, it was important to have a meeting with the student to verbalize what had occurred, give consequences for the behavior, and convey the importance of honesty in an academic setting. Other faculty notified the student, but did not feel it necessary to go beyond in talking about the ethical dynamics of what had occurred or how the cheating behavior affected others. For these faculty, it did not seem that talking about the appropriateness of the student's behavior was beneficial. For one faculty member in particular, this was not what he was paid to do here at the university level. He felt student misconduct should be punished and the student would know why it was wrong.

Summary

Answers to the final guiding question of the study, perhaps the most important of all questions, were not as forthcoming as the other four guiding questions. The definition of student moral development, as it relates to the lack of student integrity in academic work, or the inability to make wise decisions about whether or not to cheat, was not easily articulated by faculty. Using faculty reporting on four question items, I gained insight into survey faculty's opinions about declarative statements. These declarative statements indirectly suggested a student might *learn* from being involved in a cheating episode. Faculty who participated in individual interviews and focus groups also gave evidence of having a student development perspective. By verbalizing their perceptions that a student *learned* something from being caught cheating, participating faculty ascribed to the belief that college students are still developing in their ethical decision making skills. Although a student development perspective was evidenced in faculty to a degree, faculty articulation of specific student learning was more difficult in coming.

ST COPY AVAILABL

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Much of the research on academic dishonesty heretofore has been conducted using a student perspective. A review of literature revealed a need to know faculty's role in addressing cheating at the collegiate level, specifically the dissemination of information and the handling of student academic misconduct. Additionally needed was a deeper insight into the faculty perspective of student development as related to student cheating and the lack of moral judgment. This chapter includes a brief summary of the findings from the analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data gathered from participating undergraduate teaching faculty at Kansas State University during four semesters from fall 1999 to spring 2001. The chapter continues with a discussion and recommendations made from the findings of the study. Implications and recommendations are made for both faculty and student development specialists affiliated with the University. Reflections on the limitations of the study are then noted, as well as a listing of recommendations for further study. In summary, I express general conclusions.

Summary of Findings

Introduction

This investigation combined qualitative and quantitative research methods to study the role of Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty in addressing issues of academic dishonesty. In fall 1999 semester, two focus groups of selected faculty members refined a questionnaire on academic dishonesty. The following spring 2001 semester, the survey was administered to faculty campus-wide. Respondents who represented themselves as full time undergraduate teaching faculty who had taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students in the last four semesters at KSU (fall 1999-spring 2001). There was a 59.65% overall response rate of participants. Survey respondents were invited to contact the researcher for an interview to relate personal situations where they had handled a cheating episode and this became one qualitative component of the study. Other qualitative components included (a) non-participant observations in selected classrooms conducted on first-day class sessions each semester during the study, and (b) Kansas State University artifacts such as mission statements, syllabi, student newspaper accounts, and Honor System web site information. A combined approach in data collection led to a rich and thick description of how participating faculty addressed academic dishonesty at Kansas State University during the first two years of the KSU Undergraduate Honor System. The following sections include results of the analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data collected.

Setting.

Kansas State University experienced a severe episode of academic dishonesty in the Biology department in fall semester 1994. This event involved numerous students and was the focus of national attention. A campus-wide dialogue about lack of integrity in the classroom initiated a task force recommendation that KSU implement a new policy on academic dishonesty. An Honor Council of students and faculty designed a constitution and accompanying by-laws for the new policy. After unanimous approval by the KSU Honor Council, Student Senate and Faculty Senate, a modified Honor System was implemented in fall semester 1999 and continues to serve as the official academic dishonesty policy.

Demographics.

Appendix B encapsulates demographic information on study participants in *all* components of the study. S*urvey* faculty are reported as full time Kansas State University faculty who had taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students within four semesters—fall 1999 through spring 2001. Seven of nine Kansas State University colleges were represented in all components of the study, with the College of Veterinary Science and the College of Technology in Salina being the two exceptions due to composition (graduate students) or researcher inconvenience (distant campus). Fifty-nine KSU departments were also represented by participating faculty. Respondents were evenly represented in four ranks—Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. In the campus-wide survey, the majority of respondents reported being tenured, male, Caucasian and of US citizenship. Faculty reported being evenly divided in aggregate number of years in teaching K-State undergraduates—one-third 1 to 5 years, one-third 6 to 15 years, and one-third 16 and more years. Fictitious first names were used throughout the study, protecting the confidentiality of faculty's comments. Other identifying information such as discipline, class teaching assignment, and identifying student information was also guarded.

Question 1: Meaning of the Term *Academic Dishonesty*

When survey and focus group faculty were asked to write, in three words or a phrase, what meaning they make of the term *academic dishonesty*, many wrote words such as cheating, plagiarizing, and copying. Survey faculty agreement about what constituted academic dishonesty was not as evident when scenarios were presented. An overwhelming majority of survey faculty reported agreement that Scenario 1 was *not*

EST COPY AVAILABL

cheating. Almost three-fourths of survey faculty indicated agreement that Scenarios 3 and 4 were *not* cheating. Scenario 2 proved more conflicting in that survey faculty were nearly split in reporting their agreement about the dishonesty of using the same book review for more than one course. All scenarios prompted written qualifying information near the item number.

Question 2: Dissemination of Information

Many respondents reported familiarity with KSU's Undergraduate Honor System; however, few faculty indicated having more than cursory knowledge of its procedures. Although a fair number of survey respondents reported their agreement that class time should be taken to address academic dishonesty, not all KSU faculty in this study—observation of *first-day* sessions—communicated *verbally* what they considered academic student misconduct. Percentage-wise, fewer survey faculty reported, in their opinions, that there was a need for *written* information on what constitutes cheating. In practice, more survey and observation faculty used written methods to inform students of policy, the opposite of reported faculty opinions about giving verbal and written information. Faculty comments during interviews and focus groups illustrated faculty opinions of the need for written instructions on assignments, especially in cases of authorized and unauthorized collaboration. Faculty in this study reported using a variety of methods and practices to disseminate information about cheating—verbalizations in classroom discussions and individual student communication, written documentation in syllabi and assignment instructions, and using the Honor Pledge. Observation faculty, for the most part, used generic paragraphs about the general university warning about plagiarism and cheating—the *Inside KSU* resource whose reference is outdated.

Question 3: Handling Episodes of Student Cheating

Over half the survey faculty indicated being unaware of a cheating episode in their classes during the study's four-semester time frame. One fifth of the survey faculty reported suspecting an infraction, but not being certain. Approximately one out of five faculty indicated awareness and giving students a sanction or penalty. A minority of faculty reported they were aware a cheating episode had occurred, but did not sanction or discipline the offending student. Survey faculty reported plagiarism as the most commonly occurring type of cheating, followed by a tie between unauthorized collaboration on an assignment and unauthorized copying of an assignment. Unauthorized help on tests, quizzes and finals made up a much smaller percentage of episodes reported by survey faculty.

In relation to class size in which cheating was reported, faculty reported more instances of plagiarism in the lower two categories—classes with 5 to 20 students and classes with 21 to 50 students. A contributing factor might be that written assignments are typically given in smaller classes where plagiarism is more likely to occur. Copying on quizzes and exams was reported in more numbers in classes with more than 50 students in enrollment. Again, situation may play a part. Cramped quarters and impersonal instructor/student relationships may contribute to students feeling less likely to be caught. Survey faculty reported occurrences of copying of another's assignment and turning in as one's own more consistently in all class enrollment categories. Generally speaking, survey faculty used a broad range of sanctions when they found students cheating in their courses. For the most part, faculty who suspected academic dishonesty, but were not quite certain, gave warnings both to individuals and to the class as a whole.

When focus group and interview faculty were asked to discuss personal episodes in dealing with student misconduct, four themes emerged--(a) the act of dishonesty, (b) a student's reaction after being caught by the instructor, (c) the sanction imposed by the faculty member, and (d) expressed feelings of involved faculty. Faculty discussed a variety of student behaviors they considered academically dishonest. They also gave their own perceptions of student reactions when confronted, including disbelief, denial, anger, visible shame and regret, as well as apologetic overtures. The variety of sanctions given students included warnings on one end of the spectrum of sanctions to suspension on the other end. Faculty indicated having a variety of feelings in the whole process, including but not limited to shock, physical stomach reactions, disbelief, disappointment, sadness, regret, and anger—feelings much like those students reportedly experienced.

Question 4: Faculty Training and Orientation

For the most part, participating K-State faculty reported they did not receive the benefit of training or orientation in addressing cheating episodes. Faculty who did report having been trained or oriented in what to do with students who cheat also reported what type of training or orientation they received. Some faculty reported going through a workshop or seminar. A similar number of faculty reported consulting the Faculty Handbook for definitions of academic dishonesty and plagiarism, as well as becoming more knowledgeable of university policy and procedures. Aware of the new university policy in the form of the Honor System, some faculty contacted the Director or the web site for information on what procedures to take. Additionally, a few faculty reported learning more about addressing student cheating while serving on the Honor Council. For other faculty, reported consultation with colleagues or more experienced instructors seemed helpful.

Question 5: Faculty Perspective of Student Moral Judgment Development

Four statements on the survey, Items Q-15 to Q-18, addressed the guiding question that relates to faculty perspective of students' moral development in the college years. An overwhelming majority of faculty indicated that instructors should take time to discuss a cheating episode with an offending student. If faculty have this belief, they may also believe students will *learn* something during the interaction and thus grow in moral judgment and decision-making skills. Similarly, but not in as large a percentage, faculty reported they believe students learn from being caught cheating and given a sanction. Qualitative faculty comments written on the survey suggest some faculty have some doubts on what is learned. When asked to respond to a statement defining a cheater as always a cheater, most faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed. Disagreeing with this statement suggests that faculty believe students are still developing in moral judgment. Finally, faculty overwhelmingly agreed or strongly agreed it is part of an instructor's role to help students learn ethical behavior within the context of academia.

As regards the results of the internal consistency of these four items in the survey (Q-15, Q-16, Q-17, and Q-18), several possible explanations come to mind. *Faculty perspective of student development* is not an easy construct to translate into survey test items. Some faculty members who felt the questions ambiguous and wrote so under the question itself may be representative of faculty members who did not make mention of the confusing nature of the items on their questionnaires. The low Cronbach alpha may also be due to multiple dimensions of the construct--*perspective of student* *development*. Faculty may see students who copy off tests in a different light than students who cite sources incorrectly in a paper. The former instance may be seen as morally wrong and the latter may be viewed as cheating due to ignorance. In these two cases, faculty may address the dishonest behaviors differently. Likewise, it might be that faculty do not think episodes of cheating or academic dishonesty are connected with a student's moral development, but rather that the student learning which takes place during these episodes might be *procedural* lessons, such as how not to plagiarize, how to study more effectively, or how to relieve stress before testing. Finally, item flaws may have contributed to the items' unrelatedness. Whatever the reason for the virtual lack of relatedness among these four items, further research should be conducted with a larger and perhaps multi-dimensional scale. Five to six questions in each of at least four different areas of cheating--plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, copying on tests, and fabrication--may be better analyzed through factor analyses.

When focus group and individual interview faculty related how they handled episodes of cheating, some verbalized their opinion that students they caught and sanctioned did learn from the episode. Some faculty expressed that they felt the student learned a lesson, whatever that lesson was, due to the fear and frustration in being caught and given a penalty. Other faculty spoke of student moral development in terms of the *lack* of academic integrity, especially influenced by the consumer mentality currently in vogue in academia. This philosophy speaks to student goals in attaining an education—whether for *living* or for *livelihood*, as one faculty member so eloquently stated. In discussing academic consumer mentality, faculty believed students felt entitled to grades and a degree, thus being influenced to justify the end and not the mean.

When I inquired whether one faculty felt it was in his role to educate students in moral judgment and ethical decision-making, he stated that there should be classes for that purpose, classes in critical thinking and moral reasoning as his previous campus offered. More than a couple faculty, however, spoke about some of the ways they believe they *are* educating students by modeling and discussing ethical issues and decisions, both in classroom settings and in one-on-one discussions after a student has cheated. Another faculty used an analogy of calling pitches in a baseball game to giving students notice of their indiscretions whenever they occur, however often they occur.

More than one interview faculty demonstrated Kohlberg's higher moral reasoning skills in describing the impact cheating has on everyone from cheater to university to society. It is this higher reasoning skill that students need to hear in order to develop in their own moral judgment. Faculty who hold discussions using moral reasoning can facilitate moral judgment development in their students (Rest & Narvaez, 1991).

Finally, interviewed faculty members were asked to give a brief, but general message about academic dishonesty to students. Along with common short answers such as *it doesn't pay*, it *will come back to get you*, and *you are just hurting yourself*, faculty also gave thoughtful advice about reflecting on who you are as a person, understanding who you impact when you cheat, and developing a trusting relationship with your instructors and fellow classmates. In other words, some faculty encouraged the dialogue of integrity over the dialogue of academic dishonesty.

The five guiding questions in this study were answered by participating faculty in focus groups, a campus-wide survey, individual interviews, and non-participant observations in first-day class sessions within the time frame of four semesters between fall 1999 and spring 2001. KSU study participants defined academic dishonesty in various terms and scenarios. Although only a small amount in many instances, participating faculty did disseminate information about academic dishonesty to their students. An overwhelming majority of faculty reported having knowledge of the KSU Undergraduate Honor System, albeit very few self-reported knowing its procedures or the underlying student development aspect of the current policy. Over half the survey faculty were aware of a cheating episode occurring in the four semesters of the study, yet some did not sanction guilty students. Faculty reported types of cheating behavior they were aware had happened, as well as the class enrollment for each of the acts of misconduct. Faculty also reported using a variety of sanctions from giving warnings to suspending the academically dishonest students.

A small number of faculty responded to the invitation to participate in interviews to relate personal episodes of student cheating, including what they considered to be cheating, the student's reaction to being caught, sanctions given, and feelings they themselves experienced in the whole process. K-State participating faculty demonstrated, in their survey responses and interview comments, that they have a student development perspective when addressing academic dishonesty issues. In some instances faculty struggled in finding appropriate terms and articulating *what* students learn if they are caught and sanctioned. Some faculty members were clear in their messages to students about academic dishonesty: learn from your mistakes and realize what cheating does to the community of learners as well as yourself. Very few messages stressed developing a stronger moral character or learning skills to make appropriate ethical decisions when

EST COPY AVAILABLE

confronted with moral dilemmas, skills to use not only now while at college, but later in a chosen profession or personal life.

Discussion With Recommendations

Introduction

In this section, I discuss the overarching results of the study in relation to the possible explanations for these results. I indicate the implications of the precipitating event that caused this University to address academic dishonesty on a campus-wide and public scale. I indicate that non-participating faculty may have a range of awareness, opinions, and practices much as their colleagues who participated in this study. I then address each of the guiding questions of the study and determine possible reasons for the study's findings. In addressing the guiding questions, I note recommendations for each at the end of discussion.

Setting

The Principles of Biology 101 episode. Perhaps, in hindsight, a positive aspect of the cheating scandal that occurred in Principles of Biology 101 almost a decade ago has been the initiation of a campus dialogue on academic integrity. Due to heightened national awareness of what is considered by many as rampant academic dishonesty, some campuses are only now focusing changing policy. K-State has been involved in a movement to change campus climate and culture in regards to integrity since 1994. That major event—the Principles of Biology 101 incident—sparked the interest and determination of a handful of students and faculty to address the lack of integrity in a certain segment of K-State's population.

The KSU Honor System. Some of KSU's undergraduate teaching faculty played an important role in helping to design and implement the Honor System. Major input by faculty representatives into the creation of the new policy helped faculty assume ownership. Although the number of faculty who has used the Honor System to adjudicate dishonest students is small, that number grows with each new semester. With continued use, the Honor System and its procedures should reach more faculty members, both current and new to the University.

Demographics.

Survey frame. The majority of the undergraduate teaching faculty who taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students in the span of four semesters—fall 1999 to spring 2001--did respond to the campus-wide survey. Care was taken to involve faculty from seven colleges in all other components of the study, including the focus groups, the individual survey faculty self-referrals, and the non-participant observations of first-day class sessions. It is reasonable to conclude that a good range of K-State undergraduate teaching faculty participated in this study. Although it is *technically* impossible to generalize to the total KSU undergraduate teaching faculty as it relates to academic dishonesty, it is *practically* beneficial to address concerns about this important issue—cheating—using the results of this study.

Question 1: Meaning of the Term *Academic Dishonesty*

Findings. Four findings from this study stand out concerning how study participants made meaning of the term academic dishonesty:

> (a) Most faculty members used words such as *cheating*, *plagiarizing*, and *copying* when they attempted to make meaning of the term academic dishonesty.

(b) Some faculty used words that suggested student behavior; others used words that suggested student character or a student personality trait; others expressed the term in consequences of cheating; and some used unique words and phrases.
(c) Given a set of four scenarios on student behavior, a majority of faculty were of the opinion that talking about a test in public, using Greek test files, and resubmitting lab reports in a subsequent semester were not cheating. However, there was most conflicting opinion about the use of a book review in more than one class.
(d) Faculty perceptions about student collaboration on assignments and projects were varied. Although some faculty recognized the need for collaboration and the advocacy of such activity by public education professionals and business executives, faculty reported their concern also for individual assessment of student talent and knowledge.

Recommendations. Given differing faculty opinions about what constitutes cheating, it may be that more dialogue is needed *within* KSU departments, and even more critically *among* departments. There should be some basic guidelines on what is acceptable, especially in the area of collaboration. It is not necessary that all departments have the same opinions about what constitutes academic dishonesty, but whatever the opinions, expectations should be clear and explicit for students *in each course*. Even varying opinions from one faculty to another *within* departments is acceptable. In Scenario 2 of the survey, where faculty were asked if a book review used in two separate courses was considered cheating, reporting faculty were almost evenly split on their opinions. The critical, and most often missing, piece to the academic dishonesty dilemma is interaction with students about what the individual faculty member considers inappropriate.

I offer that it is normal, and often healthy for student development, that faculty hold differing opinions about what constitutes academic dishonesty. William Perry (1968/1999) suggested in his scheme of development, that students change in their reasoning ability during the college years. They move from dualistic reasoning (black and white, good and bad, right and wrong) to multiplictic thinking. Multiplictic reasoning allows students the ability to understand different faculty expectations due to "...[students'] discovery of diversity in other people's points of view..." (p. 3). Faculty can facilitate student development when they clearly express their expectations and reasoning for assignment requirements.

It may be beneficial for faculty to use scenarios and cases in their verbalizations about academic dishonesty. Scenarios much like the four on the campus-wide questionnaire can trigger dialogue between faculty and students. Faculty may then use this opportunity to clearly express what is and is not acceptable in this particular course setting. Syllabi and assignment instruction sheets should be written reinforcements to verbal comments. Faculty reported a three to one split on Scenarios 3 and 4 concerning test files and lab report assignments. Scenarios such as these illustrate the need for individual faculty to hold discussions about expectations, not only on the first day of class, but throughout the semester and with each assignment.

Table 22, on page 141, noted inconsistencies for incidents of unauthorized aid. Plagiarism and copying homework and other students' assignments were reported as happening much more often than direct copying of exam questions. Considering these reports, faculty may consider giving more information about the more frequent types of cheating behavior. Students may benefit in being given examples of plagiarism and correct ways of citing material, especially material accessed on the World Wide Web. Students do receive instruction in English Composition courses, however not all students are enrolled in English courses their first year in college. These students, depending on high school preparation, may especially be lacking in proper citing skills.

Since allowing students the opportunity to collaborate on assignments and projects is becoming more common in faculty pedagogy, it is necessary to communicate more clearly faculty expectations for such activity. The Honor System has adjudicated many cases involving unauthorized collaboration between students. For quite a number of these cases faculty have failed to give clear verbal or written parameters on what was expected or acceptable in the way of collaboration. Students benefit when faculty addresses this issue with each assignment and makes clear expectations about dishonest work.

Fass (1998) maintained that clearer definitions of academic dishonesty are needed to help alleviate some of the confusion both faculty and students experience when making decisions on appropriate academic behavior. The author suggested the following topics as a minimum for a complete statement of the definitions of academic dishonesty:

> (a) Ethics of examinations;
> (b) Use of sources on papers and projects;
> (c) Writing assistance and other tutoring;
> (d) Collecting and reporting data;
> (e) Use of academic resources;
> (f) Respecting the work of others;
> (g) Computer ethics;
> (h) Giving assistance to others; and
> (i) Adherence to academic regulations. (pp. 173-174)

K-State faculty members address many of these issues in Appendix F of the Faculty Handbook on the definition of cheating and plagiarism. It might prove beneficial, in light of the technological advances made since the authoring of the document, that certain topics are revisited for clearer and more explicit definitions. K-State faculty members have the ultimate say in their own courses about what constitutes academic dishonesty. The KSU Honor System honors that faculty privilege; however, along with that privilege comes faculty responsibility to make clear to students their expectations, whether verbally or preferably, in writing.

Question 2: Dissemination of Information

Findings. Several major findings were noted about study participants concerning the dissemination of information to students about what constitutes cheating.

> (a) Although most faculty members reported familiarity with the KSU Honor System, only a minority indicated that they were familiar or very familiar with the Honor System policy or procedures. Almost no faculty members were familiar with the student development philosophy motivating Honor System procedures.
> (b) When sharing opinions about the need for the dissemination of information on what constitutes cheating, reported faculty opinion strongly favored the need for *verbal* communication; to a lesser degree faculty also favored the need for *written* information.
> (c) In practice, faculty used *written* methods much more than verbal methods in disseminating information about their own or university policy and procedures.
> (d) Participating faculty used the Honor Pledge as a means of disseminating information about what is considered cheating. The Honor Pledge clearly states that unauthorized aid will neither be given nor received on academic work.
> (e) A cursory check of KSU web sites for information about the Honor System policy resulted in one college with first-tier linkage, one with second-tier, two with fifth-tier, one with "hidden" linkage, and one without linkage. Hale Library did link with the Library Services for Continuing Education Students, but not with regular services for all students. The Provost's Office had second-tier linkage.

Recommendations. For faculty, it is not enough to know *about* the KSU Honor System; it is critical to know its mission and philosophy. It is very important to know procedures, as they are needed for individual cases of dishonesty. The Honor System staff should continue to attend dean and departmental meetings to share information about the Honor System, especially its student development philosophy and procedures. In turn, deans and department heads should ensure that faculty receive updated information to pass on to students. Faculty should be provided the arena to discuss academic dishonesty issues, both on the university level and on the departmental level. Orientation of new faculty to Honor System policy and procedures needs to occur within the first semester of employment, preferably within the first month. Honor Council members as well as members of the student peer group, H.I.P.E.-Believe It! who are tasked with educating the campus community, need to be available and visible as campus models to faculty. Some Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty members have played major roles in both the dissemination information and the adjudication of infractions of the Honor Pledge through appropriate policy channels. Other K-State undergraduate teaching faculty have fallen short in making their own, and the University's, expectations known to students attending in their classes.

A majority of study participants reported the need for verbal and written communication about academic dishonesty, but some faculty were not of the opinion this is in their purview. Most faculty, as I, were probably not educated in a time when collaboration was widely used as a teaching strategy. We usually submitted to faculty academic work we worked on alone, without help from classmates. In the past decade, the encouragement of collaboration on projects and assignments has been evident in high schools settings. Students are coming to college expecting to work in teams and small groups and are accustomed to collaborating on homework assignments and projects. If faculty members do not want collaboration on such class activities, they need to make this desire *very clear* to students because the default, at least in students' eyes, seems to be that collaboration is not cheating.

In practice, participating faculty relied on *written* information to inform students about academic dishonesty issues. Most written information consisted of generic paragraphs about plagiarism and cheating found in the University Faculty Handbook. In some of the syllabi, the resource was not updated to reflect a newer title of the section on student academic misconduct; the old *Inside KSU* reference was the only information available to students. Some faculty used the Honor System's web site information and home page location. Especially in the initial meeting with a class, it is important for faculty to stress expectations for academic work. Mentioning parameters for coursework to be handed in sets a tone for that particular class and alerts students to what will be acceptable and what could be seen as a violation of the Honor Pledge.

Students, as perceived by faculty, do not often ask questions about academic dishonesty, so it might be helpful if faculty begin this dialogue from day one. Along with discussions about cheating, faculty and student interaction about ethical issues within a discipline being taught could facilitate student development. Another benefit in such discussions is the respect developed between faculty and students. Respect then fosters an environment where academic dishonesty is less likely to occur.

When I compared one faculty member's survey responses and his actual first-day class session, there was a discrepancy between his opinion that information about cheating need *not* be given and his 5-minute talk about cheating on the first day of class. When faculty do not feel they need to talk about academic dishonesty and yet do spend time discussing it, what is the quality of the message? Are students aware of a mixed message? Faculty members who believe there is a need to talk about cheating behavior should tailor their messages to reflect the parameters of what is acceptable, but also send a strong message that dishonest behavior will not be acceptable or tolerated.

This particular study led to the finding that there are KSU undergraduate teaching faculty members who disseminate information about cheating, yet do not necessarily use a student development perspective. In this respect there may be range of reasons why this is so. Some faculty who engage in information giving may want to avoid noncompliance with departmental procedure. With other faculty, the reason may be self-serving. There is a real threat of lawsuit when faculty does not follow university policy in adjudicating academic misconduct. In other instances, faculty may want to make certain students have been "Miranda-ized"; that is, students who know what constitutes cheating will not be given leniency if caught engaging in dishonest academic acts.

Blimling, Whitt, and Associates (1999) noted that there is a need to be careful with the mindless dissemination of written information. Simply passing out Honor System policy brochures or having students write out the Honor Pledge on assignments and assessments should not derail a much needed in-class conversation. Needed is a discussion concerning the unacceptable, what constitutes cheating behavior in an academic community. More important, the conversation should describe acceptable behaviors and a challenge for students to conduct themselves in honorable and trustworthy ways. A few KSU study faculty used the term *cop* in discussing their role in addressing academic dishonesty, a role with which they were not comfortable. The following is an example of how one faculty member at another institution resolved her role in disseminating information about cheating. In an interview with Evelyn Tribble, a Teaching Technology Fellow and associate professor of English at Temple University, Jodi Levine (2001) facilitated the following conversation:

> **Levine:** What about the academically honest students, the percentage who will not engage in academically dishonest behavior?
>
> **Tribble:** The way I have started thinking about the problem is, What about all the students who don't cheat? I think there is a reluctance to talk about the problem,

> because people are afraid of creating a negative atmosphere, not wanting to sound like a *cop* or like someone who thinks that all students are cheaters. The way I have thought about it this year, and what I have done in my classes, is to make clear what my policies are and how I will enforce them. I say to them explicitly, 'I do this not because I think all of you are cheaters but because I think that almost all of you are not cheaters. It is not fair for those of you that are doing the work, and working really hard and maybe not getting the grade that you want, to have someone come along and without any repercussion download a paper and hand it in. It must be very demoralizing to think other people can get around the rules and have nothing happen to them.' Students respond to this. You need to protect the students who are doing honest work. (p. 12)

When looking for dissemination of information at KSU by electronic means, I found that the College of Education had the only web site home page with first-tier linkage to the Honor System. This refers to the fact that the College of Education's home page on their web site contained a link to access the Honor System web site where students and faculty can find further information about the University's integrity policy and procedures. All colleges should have first-tier linkage off their web site home pages, where direct access to the Honor System is available to each college's faculty and students. The message would clearly show a united front in promoting integrity at K-State. Each faculty member, in turn, should have first-tier linkage for their syllabi and class web sites.

Question 3: Handling Episodes of Student Cheating

Findings. When interviewed faculty responded to my inquiries about student cheating episodes and how they were handled, a variety of findings emerged:

(a) Slightly more than half the survey faculty indicated being aware of an incidence of cheating.
(b) One out of five faculty reported suspecting cheating, but not being certain.
(c) A similar number of faculty indicated awareness of infractions and sanctioning students for the misconduct.
(d) A few faculty reported awareness of cheating incidents, but also reported their choices not to sanction students.
(e) Plagiarism was the most commonly reported act of academic dishonesty, followed by unauthorized collaboration and unauthorized copying. A much smaller percentage of reported cheating occurred as cheating on exams and quizzes.
(f) Plagiarism was reported as the most common form of cheating in small to medium-sized classes. Quiz and exam cheating was reported as occurring more where classes had large enrollments. Copying another's assignment and turning it in as one's own was the violation reported as having consistent numbers no matter what the enrollment size of the class.
(g) Faculty reported using a variety of sanctions and warnings were reported as very common, both with individuals and with classes as a whole.
(h) From focus group and individual self-initiated faculty interview transcripts, a variety of data were noted on student cheating episodes. Faculty expressed differences in what they saw as dishonest student behavior, how students reacted to being caught, sanctions imposed on students, and feelings faculty experienced in dealing with the incident.
(i) Faculty discussed frustration due to the difficulty in detecting cheating. They also illustrated methods used to prevent academic dishonesty.

Recommendations. Donald McCabe's (2000) most recent survey, conducted on 21 campuses around the country in which over 2100 students participated, found that 33% of the responding students admitted to cheating on tests. Additionally, self-reported cheating on written work was 50%. These figures suggest much cheating at the collegiate level and Kansas State University is not immune to having its share of episodes of academic student misconduct. Although faculty made an honest attempt at addressing the

EST COPY AVAILABL

issue with students, not all them made reports to the Honor System, as University policy stipulates.

Critical to the success of changing the K-State cheating culture is the necessity for faculty to file a report for each incident of academic misconduct. The Honor System web site facilitates this procedure with a downloadable report form. Faculty are autonomous in that they may adjudicate the episode on their own; however, reporting the incident means the student's name is on file and any further violations triggers an automatic hearing panel meeting. If faculty does not report all incidents, some students may continue in inappropriate behavior throughout their college careers.

When faculty is uncertain whether a student has cheated, it is wise to follow up with the student in the form of a discussion about the episode. One survey respondent wrote in the margin of Item Q-15, the statement asking for faculty opinion on whether faculty should take time to discuss an episode with a student, "generally to determine whether cheating was ignorance or done with malice." At this point, faculty may be trying to understand if a violation has occurred in the first place, or faculty may be trying to determine whether the dishonest student can learn from the situation. Either way, faculty can facilitate student development by modeling that the episode was important enough to be investigated.

It is appropriate to point out that faculty who do not choose to address breeches of the Honor Pledge may be modeling a moral development stage where decisions are based on self rather than other. Does it take too much personal time to talk to a possible offender, to talk a student through the process? If a violation has occurred and the faculty member does not address the situation with the student, might reluctance come from personal faculty feelings of hurt, resentment, or anger? If faculty members choose not to hold a discussion with an alleged violator, might the faculty member be missing an opportune time to teach a lesson in ethical decision-making? In thinking of self, are faculty members who do not get involved hurting the larger campus community?

As I heard faculty's words in explaining a sanction to a student, I did not hear comments such as, "This was unethical and a detriment to the search for truth," even if the truth in this instance is the true assessment of a student's talent or knowledge. Students need to hear faculty say HOW a behavior is inappropriate (*You handed in someone else's work.*), but more important, students need to hear WHY the behavior was unethical (*You are hurting the community of learners.*). It would be helpful for instructors to develop skills for addressing academic dishonesty with their students. Faculty modeling critical thinking allows students to learn new decision-making skills in thinking about whether or not to cheat the next time.

Almost 23% of survey faculty indicated awareness and sanctioning or giving students a penalty. Just over 6% of faculty reported they were aware of a cheating episode, but did *not* sanction the student. There are various reasons why faculty does not sanction students. Faculty may feel a student having cheated and found out may learn from simply sitting down and speaking with faculty one-on-one. For some faculty it is a matter of doubt about what sanctions are available and appropriate to the circumstance. Although the Honor System had been in existence for four semesters, there were faculty members who had no knowledge of the XF sanction typically given students whose cases are investigated and adjudicated by Honor System hearing panels. Some colleagues intimated to interview participant Dick that dealing with dishonest students was just too much trouble, too much trouble for the student and too much trouble for the reporting faculty member. *Trouble* translates into the commitment of personal time, the writing of reports, and the angst associated with confronting students.

Fear of grievances or litigation might also prevent some faculty from pursuing suspected cheating. In actuality, faculty ought to be more fearful of not reporting an episode to the Honor System. Donald Gehring (1998) warns that faculty members take a risk when they handle cases on their own *without following University policy*. Legal courts have historically left academic dishonesty issues in the hands of faculty *as long as faculty follow university guidelines*; and "[s]ince failing to follow procedures contained in official publications would be acting outside the scope of one's employment the institution would not be obliged to provide legal representation" (p. 87).

Faculty members need an arena where they can discuss and debate their views about cheating behavior. For the most part, participants were curious about methods that have worked for their colleagues, as well as methods that have failed. Faculty members do not have to be alone in their thoughts and feelings when they experience a cheating episode. Much as physicians use a team approach when discussing difficult patient cases, faculty can also discuss cases of academic dishonesty without using identifying student information. Focus group faculty in this study agreed that an hour's discussion on collegiate cheating opened their minds to different ideas and strategies to use. Discussions of this sort could also lead to better communication with students. Faculty members have a duty to express their own expectations in clear and explicit terms and students have a responsibility to honor those expectations. Therein lies the groundwork for building trust and respect in the community of learners, and possibly diminish incidents of academic dishonesty.

Question 4: Training and Orientation

Findings. When asked about receiving training or orientation in addressing academic dishonesty issues, participating faculty reports illustrated the following themes:

> (a) The majority, 71%, of participating KSU undergraduate teaching faculty reported they had not received the benefit of training or orientation in addressing cheating episodes.
> (b) A very small percentage of faculty indicated receiving instruction in a workshop or seminar setting.
> (c) A similar number of survey faculty reported having had training or orientation while reading the Faculty Handbook for definitions of academic dishonesty and plagiarism.
> (d) Some faculty became involved with the Honor System while addressing an incident of student misconduct, thus learning more about its policy and procedures first-hand.
> (e) Some faculty contacted the Director of the Honor System for help in dealing with student cheating.
> (f) A small group of faculty learned more about academic dishonesty while serving on the Honor System Honor Council.

Recommendations. If faculty did not receive training or orientation in how to address student cheating, how did they learn what to do when a situation presents itself? In talking with faculty who participated in this study, I was given the impression that, for the most part, faculty struggled. Faculty struggled through a few episodes before they learned methods to help in future encounters with academically dishonesty students. In some cases, faculty struggled with knowing what procedures to take due to the uniqueness of the case. In other instances faculty struggled with keeping their emotions in check while dealing with a student who had cheated. In a few cases, participating faculty were unsure of due process and sanctioning guidelines. Variances in faculty practices in addressing academic dishonesty may stem from differing amounts of training or orientation given faculty that focuses specifically on this student issue.

Each new undergraduate teaching faculty member hired by Kansas State University should have orientation specific to the University's Undergraduate Honor System. The orientation, as it relates to academic integrity, should have a student development perspective in its terminology and philosophy. It should be in the Provost's purview to set aside adequate time for introducing Honor System staff during new faculty orientation at the beginning of each semester. Honor System staff and the H.I.P.E.-Believe It! group are equipped with presentation strategies and materials to furnish a brief, but meaningful message about the importance of following University policy when addressing academic dishonesty.

Some reporting faculty received university and departmental orientation about academic dishonesty issues. During the year before the implementation of the Honor System, its Director and his staff made presentations to as many deans and departmental heads as time would allow. Deans and department heads should consider continuing this type of orientation, if for no other reason than to update the colleges and departments about the status of cases coming through the Honor System office. Special reminder memos about accessing the Honor System web site and information on appropriate form usage is critical to having consistency and uniformity when dealing with a specific case.

Most KSU faculty orientation came from reading excerpts of the Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Handbook, found on the Provost's web site as well as in the bound handbook form, provides information about academic dishonesty and the KSU Undergraduate Honor System in Appendix F. In the introduction to the section, the

Handbook states, "All academic relationships ought to be governed by a sense of honor, fair play, trust, and a readiness to give appropriate credit to the intellectual endeavors of others..." (KSU Faculty Handbook, 2001). The section follows with the definition of plagiarism and other academic misconduct that will not be tolerated by members of the learning community.

Definitions are very helpful; however, few sections in the handbook give faculty orientation in exactly how to address students they suspect having violated an Honor System policy. Nothing suggests how faculty should address the student development aspects of their practices. The Undergraduate Honor System staff, with endorsement from the Provost, should design and develop a faculty/instructor's guide to academic integrity. Such a guide should provide five main sections:

(a) A brief theoretical orientation to academic dishonesty as it relates to student moral judgment development and ethical decision-making approaches;

(b) A comprehensive systematic and how-to checklist explanation of the KSU Undergraduate Honor System procedures to be used by faculty who suspect academic dishonesty has occurred;

(c) A self-assessment checklist of faculty practices associated with the prevention of academic dishonesty;

(d) A *best practices* guide to addressing a variety of cheating episodes; and

(e) A comprehensive bibliography and resource listing for issues in academic dishonesty.

A faculty/instructor's guide to academic integrity would help faculty answer questions such as those listed below. These questions are not all-inclusive of topics needing to be addressed:

-Do I know who to contact or where to call if I need information about handling an episode of student academic dishonesty?
-Do I know where to file a report for the Honor System?
-Is it 'legal' for me to handle episodes of cheating on my own?
-Is there a chance I can be sued by a student if I just suspect cheating and sanction the student on the evidence I have?
-What happens to the information I send to the Honor System office?
-Do I have the KSU Undergraduate Honor System book marked on my browser?
-Do I have to give a student 'due process' and what can happen if I don't?
-Is there a resource available to help me determine if I have a case of plagiarism on my hands?
-Do I know what the XF sanction means and when I can use it?
-Can I assign an XF *without* going through the KSU Honor System?
-What does my GTA need to know about handling cheating episodes?
-What sanctions and penalties have educational value?
-Are there some academic dishonesty terms that are better to use with students who have been caught cheating?
-Are there discussion-starters that are better to use with various class enrollments?

A guide such as this could be linked on the Honor System web site for faculty ease in access and utilization.

Persons responsible for faculty assessment and teaching evaluations should include an appropriate question(s) on evaluation forms concerning academic dishonesty, as it relates to faculty practices. In an attempt to foster community responsibility in issues of academic dishonesty, it would be helpful to engage students in providing feedback to faculty. Feedback on student perceptions of academic integrity and climate within the classroom setting might aid faculty in reflecting on their own practices in pedagogy and classroom management as it relates to cheating prevention. Faculty may begin asking themselves questions such as:

(a) Do I make a point of verbalizing AND giving written instructions on all assignments?
(b) Am I especially vigilant when explaining parameters concerning the use of collaboration on any assignment?
(c) Do I reference *current* sources for accessing information about KSU's honesty policy and procedures?

Having questions on faculty evaluations about faculty practices in academic integrity issues may ensure that there is more consistency in how faculty members handle episodes of academic dishonesty. Much as an instructor/faculty guide would do, the dissertation survey itself served to initiate inward reflection about one's own practices as evidenced by a focus group faculty comment:

> **Sandi:** And a comment about the survey...is that when it asked some of these things, I thought, 'Oh gosh...there's some other stuff I probably should be doing in there. I could explain this better to them.' That's a sign of a good survey. It makes you think about ways you should be doing stuff.

Faculty training and orientation in academic integrity issues is essential if the K-State learning community is to experience a cultural change as regards student academic dishonesty. Specifically, if instructors desire higher levels of student integrity in performing academic work, they must attend to their own beliefs and practices that contribute to the social norms allowing pervasive student cheating. When faculty become more consistent in the methods and procedures they use when detecting and adjudicating cheating episodes, students will receive a consistent message on what is appropriate practice in doing and handing in assignments, as well individual behavior when being assessed.

Question 5: Faculty Perspective of Student Moral Judgment Development

Findings. Four findings from this study stand out concerning faculty perspective of student moral judgment development as it relates to academic dishonesty:

(a) Participating faculty reported, for the most part, that instructors should take time to talk with students who have been caught cheating.

(b) Similarly, faculty indicated they believed that students *learn* from being caught and sanctioned or penalized.

(c) Most faculty reported they believed that once a cheater, *not* always a cheater, that students can make better ethical decisions after learning from an episode of cheating.

(d) Most participants reported they believed it is part of an instructor's role to help students learn ethical behavior in the context of the academic setting.

Recommendations. The act, whereby faculty take time to discuss a cheating episode with a student, falls into the category known as faculty/student interaction. Chickering and Reisser (1993), devoting an entire chapter to the topic entitled, student-faculty relationships, noted "faculty-student interactions can foster integrity by embodying positive values and ethical behavior" (p. 333). Faculty facilitated student moral judgment development whenever they held conversations with students about the lack of integrity in their behavior. Survey faculty also reported a belief that they should talk with students who are found cheating. In acknowledging this belief, the faculty is also expressing the belief that conversations help in educating students about ethical behavior. KSU student development specialists would do well to reinforce faculty who educate students in ethical decision-making, especially when a cheating episode has occurred.

Not all participating faculty reported a similar sentiment. For those instructors who find it not in their role, nor their comfort level, to talk with students about ethical issues after a cheating incident, the Honor System provides an alternative avenue. The Academic Integrity course's structure fills this void in faculty/student interaction. The course may be assigned as a sanction by instructors having no desire or time to *debrief* misconduct with a student. Instructors should keep this option in mind whether they send a student through the Honor System or take care of an episode themselves. Among other activities required within the course structure are two activities that facilitate student moral judgment development. One involves the mental and verbal processing of individual student violations of the Honor Pledge and the other involves discussing the ramifications of dishonesty in academia, as well as future professional settings.

Faculty may not use terms such as humanizing values, personalizing values, or congruence between stated values and behavior–terms used by Arthur Chickering and Linda Reisser (1993)–when articulating what students have learned through discussions about cheating. However, a good number of faculty do use, albeit unwittingly, a student development perspective and believe that students are still developing moral judgment, still struggling with congruence in personal values and acting on those values. Faculty participants Sandi and Dick each expressed a belief that K-State is a place where there is "room for significant moral development" and that students are "developing their ethics, their values, all that sort of thing." In discussing student development, Giesbrecht and Walker (2000) reported the following implications for faculty:

> The relationship between students' ego development and construction of a moral self provides insights for understanding ethical development among college students. This relationship also has implications for educators and counselors in facilitating ethical reflection and moral development on the college campus.....[with resulting s]igns of decreased egocentrism and expanding circle of social identification.... (p. 167).

When faculty discover student dishonesty and take time to discuss with students inappropriate behaviors and reasoning faculty facilitate moral judgment development.

When participants were asked to write single words or a phrase in the three boxes on the questionnaire, none of the faculty used the words *cheater*, *plagiarizer*, or *copier*, words that depict the person and not the action. Faculty who use *behavior* words instead of *character* words when describing academic dishonesty may be demonstrating, if not verbalizing, their belief that students are capable of changing in decision-making behavior. In other words, with their choice of words faculty may be suggesting that students are still developing when it comes to making the ethical choice whether or not to cheat. Faculty should therefore reflect on the terms they use when they think about academic dishonesty. More important, faculty should engage their students in that conversation as well.

Participants who indicated that they *agreed* or *strongly agreed* with the statement *once a cheater, always a cheater* may also believe that students cannot change the ethical reasoning motivating their ethical behavior. If this is the case faculty may throw up their hands and literally look the other way when they see students cheating. When faculty chooses not to address cheating, perceptive students are sent the wrong message. Students may come to believe that the behavior *and the unethical reasoning that motivated the behavior* are acceptable. It may be difficult to change the apathy and insensitivity concerning student academic dishonesty a minority of faculty members exhibit, but it is essential to take up the challenge if a culture of integrity is to exist among the KSU community of learners.

After conducting a sizeable study on how college affects students, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) concluded that:

> [m]easures of moral reasoning are themselves positively correlated not only with areas of general cognitive development that increase during college (such as abstract reasoning, critical thinking, and reflective judgment) but also with the general liberalization of personality and value structures coinciding with college

> attendance (for example, increases in autonomy, tolerance, and interpersonal sensitivity; increased concern for the rights and welfare of others). (p. 563).

Sometimes, faculty members are not aware of *where* students are in the stages of moral reasoning ability. Evidence of students' immature moral reasoning is illustrated by Robby, a faculty interviewee, who stated "[S]tudents were sorry they got caught, not that they were cheating." Comments such as this one reflect a preconventional Kohlbergian stage of moral development in students, where fear of punishment is the guide to one's moral reasoning. Lucy, another faculty interviewee, felt a responsibility not to let her co-instructors know about a cheating incident, so as not to "jeopardize that relationship" for her students, even though the students never apologized to her for their behavior. Lucy verbalized this sense of responsibility to her students and in doing so modeled a higher stage, or postconventional, moral judgment, where one includes others in reasoning to solve an ethical dilemma. For students to perform honest academic work, education in appropriate decision-making skills is required. Faculty, in modeling higher-level moral reasoning, influence students' own thinking.

Students can learn appropriate and honest behavior in academia when faculty holds students responsible for dishonest academic work and discuss the ethical implications of their actions. An example that illustrates this student growth in better ethical decision-making was reported by Kenneth Weiss (2000) in a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times:

> McCann [an engineering student] was caught two years ago lifting another student's homework because he couldn't figure out some problems...[I]nitially threatened with suspension for one academic quarter, McCann ended up on

EST COPY AVAILABLE

> probation with public service. McCann, now a graduate student and teaching assistant, has found himself turning in undergraduates for copying each other's homework. 'In my classes,' McCann said, 'I make an announcement: 'You do not cheat. Even if I don't catch you, you won't be able to pretend you know the material. In industry, you cannot pretend. If you don't know what you are doing, you will get fired.'

Faculty members facilitate student development in moral judgment when they take time to address students' academic dishonesty and hold them accountable for their decisions and behavior. Clearly, McCann demonstrates a higher level of moral reasoning as he is challenged by the students who attempt to cheat in his class.

Kohlberg and Gilligan reported that students at the college level are still learning what it means to be *in community*-to be aware (a) that others' views have value, (b) that one's own actions impact others, and (c) that responsible decisions require reasoning that includes both a and b. College students learn this sense of being *in community* when more experienced persons—faculty—interact with them on a personal basis. Faculty members who feel comfortable in discussing ethical issues with students, either one-on-one or in a class session, can influence students' moral judgment development.

For the same reason, the instructor of the Academic Integrity course, in conjunction with Honor System staff, should design and develop a program of reconciliation for students who have violated the Honor Pledge. In this program, students who had completed the Academic Integrity class would then meet once more with their instructors to talk about what the experience has meant for *both* students and faculty.

Meetings such as these might give students a sense of closure and faculty insight into the definite, albeit sometimes small, student growth in moral reasoning and judgment.

Recommendations for KSU Student Development Specialists

Student affairs staff who are student development specialists are also very much a part of the community of learners at K-State. Student development specialists are educated in the types of environments that foster growth in students. Chickering and Reisser (1993) enumerated seven key environmental factors that influence student development. Student-faculty relationships, third on the list, are seen as critical to providing an environment where students experience faculty in many roles and responsibilities. Student development specialists can provide the training and orientation needed to educate faculty in discussing ethical issues with students. Student development specialists can help faculty facilitate appropriate moral reasoning skills in their students, that they may learn to become the "informed, productive, and *responsible* citizens," that Kansas State University's mission statement claims its students will learn *in community*.

Student development specialists can also help faculty understand the importance of holding students accountable for their behaviors. Principle #2 in the publication of the Association for Student Judicial Affairs entitled *The State of Student Judicial Affairs: Current Forces and Future Challenges*, states:

> Holding students responsible for their conduct within a student disciplinary process is intended to provide a positive educational and developmental experience. An effective disciplinary process must be grounded in student development theory. It must be expedient, clear, consistent, fair and impartial, and respectful of individual and community rights. Many of the educational

> components of a campus judicial system are demonstrated through the application of meaningful, 'creative' sanctions, alternative dispute resolution options, and proactive as well as reactive educational activities that help students learn. Learning also takes place when standards and consequences are clearly communicated, widely understood, and fairly enforced" (Association for Student Judicial Affairs, 1998, p. 14-15).

Student development specialists should help the campus community, specifically faculty, understand that the KSU Undergraduate Honor System is a campus judicial system that is grounded in student development theory, where *educational* sanctions foster growth in moral judgment development in violators of the Pledge. Faculty should be encouraged to follow Honor System procedures in reporting academic dishonesty *because* many students who come through the Honor System will learn lessons in moral reasoning. Faculty makes up the stable population within the campus community; students typically stay no longer than four to five years. Therefore, faculty has an important responsibility to educate students about the Honor System policies and procedures whenever possible. Moreover, when they discover academic dishonesty, faculty can facilitate potential growth in students by holding them accountable for inappropriate decisions.

Limitations of the Study

As much information as this study produced about Kansas State University's undergraduate teaching faculty in relation to student academic dishonesty, generalizations cannot be made to the campus as a whole. An appropriate frame was not available for the campus-wide survey; therefore, only descriptive statistics were appropriate to report.

Only undergraduate teaching faculty who were full time during four semesters between fall 1999 and spring 2001 were part of this study. Graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) play a significant role in teaching undergraduates at this large, research university, but they were not a part of this study. Likewise, adjunct faculty and faculty who teach undergraduates part time were also left out of this study. Additionally, KSU's College of Aviation and Technology was not included in the study, even though a number of undergraduates are enrolled and are bound by the Honor System's Honor Pledge. This study was confined to undergraduate teaching faculty; K-State students were not included and therefore could not share their perspectives on faculty practices.

Suggestions for Further Study

In regard to the construct on perspective held by faculty on student development, it may be useful to develop more questions addressing this phenomenon in general, but specifically student moral judgment. Only four questions were used for this study; a more appropriate number might be at least twenty. A factor analysis of more grouped questions on specific acts of cheating might lead to a different finding, one indicative of true faculty opinions about student development in making ethical decisions concerning academic dishonesty.

Research methods similar to the ones used in this study would be helpful in understanding academic dishonesty at KSU in the eyes of graduate teaching assistants. GTAs are many times on the front line in discovering student cheating. Many GTAs grade papers and projects and are in a very good position to catch plagiarizing and copying. Graduate teaching assistants, especially younger ones, are often in a better position to hear student comments about academically dishonest acts and may even be at a social level conducive to modeling ethical decision making with students.

K-State Salina, which houses the College of Aviation and Technology, would be another campus where similar research could be conducted. Faculty at this facility shares the same University policies, including the KSU Undergraduate Honor System. Most students attending K-State Salina are undergraduates and are bound by the same Honor Pledge. It would be interesting to see if surveyed faculty would respond in a similar fashion as KSU's main campus faculty population.

Replicated studies on undergraduate teaching faculty at other institutions in Kansas and across the nation might provide interesting findings, especially if conducted at institutions that do not have honor systems. Also enlightening would be similar studies at predominently African-American and Latino institutions. Other studies are needed on faculty opinions and practices in relation to student academic dishonesty and perspective of moral judgment development, especially in different settings such as technical schools and community colleges.

Finally, because academic dishonesty starts much earlier than college for many students, it would be beneficial to conduct research at middle schools and high schools. Although teachers in these settings have different teaching goals and objectives, they do encounter similar situations. Differences may occur due to student levels of development in moral judgment reasoning, but dishonest academic acts have their roots in these populations of students.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, faculty in this study agreed that students come to college knowing what constitutes a dishonesty act, yet even faculty disagreed on what academic dishonesty was in circumstances couched as scenarios. Continued dialogue about academic ethics and appropriate behavior is imperative if students are to understand what faculty expect. When a faculty member hears a student exclaim, "I don't cheat because I might get caught," this is a strong indication that student's moral development exists in a stage of early development. To hear a student say, "I don't cheat because I don't want to violate K-State's policy on academic dishonesty and I don't want my reputation hurt," would indicate to the instructor that the student has developed a little further in moral reasoning ability. "I don't cheat because it is wrong to disadvantage others in my learning community and I value honesty and truth, which are fundamental to the educational process," is a student comment that suggests high development in ethical reasoning. The latter is a comment most instructors would like to hear. It is also a comment faculty themselves need to continue expressing and modeling in discussions about integrity in academia. Exposure to faculty's higher moral reasoning initiates a conflicting tension in students' own reasoning; students are challenged to move to a new level in looking at ways to solve ethical dilemmas, including dilemmas involving cheating. Students learn how to be persons of integrity when they are exposured to faculty members who have integrity themselves. Students learn to develop integrity when faculty members can express with confidence the reasons why it is important to be honest.

Kansas State University has developed, in its Undergraduate Honor System, a program to promote academic integrity. The Honor System, however, is not merely a set of rules and penalties about cheating, or even a clearinghouse for strategies and techniques on how to corner students who have been dishonest. The Honor System is also a budding institution whose philosophy includes both a Kohlbergian ethic of fairness and a Gilligan-founded ethic of care for others. In modeling ethics of care and fairness, the Honor System serves to facilitate students' moral development and faculty's perspective of this development. Derek Bok (1990) suggested that, "[m]oral and social responsibility cannot develop through rules and penalties alone. They must grow out of a genuine concern for others" (p. 87). In order for the KSU Honor System to grow and ultimately make a difference in K-State's culture of integrity, faculty must share in the responsibility of protecting it. Faculty can do this by becoming more knowledgeable about the Honor System's procedures. Faculty can also become more responsible when they place less emphasis on student dishonesty and more focus on the development of student integrity in academia. In their documented Appendix I, Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, and Pavela (1988) discussed strategies in developing a program to protect academic integrity. They stated:

> In the broadest sense, reducing and controlling academic dishonesty entails improving the campus environment for students. Perhaps the most important ingredient in such an effort would be fostering an appreciation of the college or university as a community of shared values. The willingness to affirm and enforce such values helps students to develop a sense of moral direction and to accept responsibility to make a constructive contribution to community life" (p. 65).

Faculty can demonstrate a community of shared values by:

(a) engaging students in ethical discussions;

(b) disseminating information about what constitutes cheating in academia;

(c) following Honor System procedures when academic dishonesty occurs;

(d) taking time to discuss cheating episodes with students; and

(e) learning more about how to facilitate moral judgment development in students.

KSU faculty members have a responsibility to address academic integrity, by the very nature of their roles. They are members of a learning community where honesty is the foundation of all work being accomplished. Rita Manning (1992) shared that, "Obligations to students are grounded upon roles of teacher and philosopher and the students' psychological needs to discover who they are and how they can live with integrity." (p. 63). Lively classroom and personal faculty-student discussions and debates using ethical dilemmas, whether discipline-related or specifically using issues of academic integrity, serve to develop stronger relationships between faculty and students. Stronger relationships between faculty and students, claims The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity (1999) brochure published by The Center for Academic Integrity, lead to honesty, trust, respect, fairness, and responsibility—the five fundamental values of academic integrity embraced by the Center as "essential to the success of our mission as educators" (p. 1).

What began with a handful of faculty and students as an attempt to change a cheating policy has evolved into an Honor System in promotion of an ethical environment. Canon and Associates (1993) suggested that, as a learning community, we need to be intentional in forming an ethical environment. They pointed out that:

> Moral environments and communities do not come into being by chance; rather, they are created when members of that community, whether few or many, thoughtfully and persistently pursue a virtuous life. And that intentional pursuit

> often requires a willingness to deal with uncomfortable realities, to take unpopular stands, to give voice to concerns that colleagues are reluctant to express. Lest words like uncomfortable, unpopular, and reluctant seem intimidating, it is important to note that the reference group's ease with these issues increases as it moves toward becoming an ethical community. One can expect more support and less dissent as discussions of ethical matters become more commonplace and as basic community values are made increasingly explicit" (p. 334).

I believe K-State's ethical environment is experiencing the phenomenon described above. There is evidence on campus that the ethical environment is changing for the better. Editorials in K-State's Collegian have become more pro-Honor System in the past three years. Faculty members are more apt to report students' misconduct as the semesters go by. Students are now inquiring of Honor System staff how to become members of the Honor Council and the H.I.P.E.-Believe it! group.

The events and aftermath of the tragedy that shook our nation on September 11, 2001 should cause us as a nation to reflect on many things, including how we act toward and for each other, how we act *in community*. In their own reflections, faculty need to consider what role they play in educating the students who are part of this community, not only in the disciplines they teach, but also in the students as a whole persons, students as future citizens of this country. For the most part, KSU participating faculty members understand that they play an influential role in educating the total person within the student. They understand that acts of academic dishonesty should not be tolerated—not because such acts undermine the hard work of faculty, or cheapen the KSU degree, but because such acts destroy trust in the community of learners; such academically dishonest acts destroy the very fabric that clothes the quest for knowledge and truths.

REFERENCES

Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue? NASPA Journal, 29, 107-113.

Aaron, R. M., & Georgia, R.T. (1994). Administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty in collegiate institutions. NASPA Journal, 31, 83-91.

Allen, J., Fuller, D., & Luckett, M. (1998). Academic integrity: Behaviors, rates, and attitudes of business students toward cheating. Journal of Marketing Education, 20, 41-52.

Anderson, P. (2000, August 4). Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System. Annual Review. Available: http://www.ksu.edu/honor/ann99-00.htm

Anderson, P. (2001, August). Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System. Annual Review. Available: http://www.ksu.edu/honor/ann00-01.htm

Association for Student Judicial Affairs (1998). The State of Student Judicial Affairs: Current Forces and Future Challenges. College Station, TX: Association for Student Judicial Affairs.

Bardige, B., Ward J. V., Gilligan, C., Taylor, J. M., & Cohen, G. (1988). Moral concerns and considerations of urban youth. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor with B. Bardige (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education (pp.159-173). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barnett, D. C., & Dalton, J. C. (1981). Why college students cheat. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22, 545-551.

Barr, M. J. (1987). Individual and institutional integrity. NASPA Journal, 24, (4), 1-5.

Blimling, G. S., Whitt, E. J. (1999). Good practices in Student Affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (1999). Universities and the future of America. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Booth, D. E. & Hoyer, P. J. (1992). Cheating: Faculty responsibilities when integrity fails. Nursing Outlook, 40, 86-93.

Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bowers, W. J. (1964). Student dishonesty and its control in college. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research.

Bryman, A. (1988). Quantity and quality in social research. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Bushweller, K. (1999, April). Generation of cheaters: Who's cheating in schools? [On-line]. Available: http://www.asbj.com/199904/0499coverstory.html

Campus Connections 98-99. Kansas State University Campus Phone Book. Manhattan, KS: Student Publications Inc.

Canon, H. J. (1993). Maintaining high ethical standards. In M. Barr and Associates (Eds), The handbook of student affairs administration. (pp. 327-339). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnevale, D. (1999, November 12). How to proctor from a distance. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A47.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and identity (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ciccantell, P. S. (Speaker). (1997). Research methods: Case Studies with Dr. Paul Ciccantell (Videotape EDCEP 816). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University.

Clifford, K. O. (1996, October). Academic integrity and campus climate at small colleges. An overview of the results of the dissertation titled Students' Perceptions of Academic Integrity and Campus Climate at the annual conference for the Center for Academic Integrity, Duke University, Durham, NC.

Cole, S., & McCabe, D. L. (1996). Issues in academic integrity. In W. L. Mercer (Ed.), Critical issues in judicial affairs: Current trends in practice (pp. 67-77). New Directions for Student Services, No. 73. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Corey, G., Corey, M. S., & Callanan, P. (1998). Issues and ethics in the helping profession. (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dalton, J. C. (1985). Values education: A new priority for college student development. In J. C. Dalton (Ed.), Promoting values development in college students (NASPA Monograph Series, No. 4, pp.17-27). Columbus, OH: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Davis, B. G. (1993). Tools for teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. Teaching of Psychology, 19, 16-20.

Davis, S.F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. Teaching of Psychology, 22, 119-121.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telepone surveys: The total design method. New York: Wiley.

Dillman, D.(2000). Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method (2^{nd} ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Eisenberger, R., & Shank, D. M. (1985). Personal work ethic and effort training affect cheating. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 520-528.

Fass, R. A. (1986). By honor bound: Encouraging academic honesty. Educational Record, 67, 32-36.

Fass, R. A. (1998). Cheating and plagiarism. In W. W. May (Ed.), Ethics in Higher Education (pp. 170-184). New York: Collier Macmillan.

Fieser, J. (2001). The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Ethics. [On-line]. Available: http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/e/ethics.htm#Normative Ethics

Fowler, F. J., Jr. (1995). Improving survey questions: Design and evaluation, Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 38. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity. (1999). Durham, NC: The Center for Academic Integrity.

Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: A survey study of college students. Research in Higher Education, 36, 687-704.

Gehring, D. (1998). When institutions and their faculty address issues of academic dishonesty. In D. D. Burnett, L. Rudolf, & K. O. Clifford (Eds.), Academic integrity matters (pp. 77-92). Washington D. C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Gehring. D., & Pavela. G. P. (1994). Issues and perspectives on academic integrity (2nd ed.). Washington DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Giesbrecht. N. Walker. L. J. (2000). Ego development and the construction of a moral self. Journal of College Student Development. 41. 157-171.

Gilligan. C. (1981). Moral development. In A. W. Chickering & Associates (Eds.). The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society (pp. 139-157). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gilligan. C. (1987a). Moral orientation and moral development. In E. F. Kittay & D. T. Myers (Eds.). Women and moral theory (pp. 19-33). Totowa. NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gilligan. C. (1987b). Remapping development: The power of divergent data. In C. Farnham (Ed.). The impact of feminist research in the academy (pp. 77-107). Bloomington. IN: Indiana University Press.

Gilligan. C. (1988a). Exit-voice dilemmas in adolescent development. In C. Gilligan. J. V. Ward. J. M. Taylor with B. Bardige (Eds.). Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education (pp.141-158). Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan. C. (1988b). Prologue: Adolescent development reconsidered. In C. Gilligan. J. V. Ward. J. M. Taylor with B. Bardige (Eds.). Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education (pp.vii-xxxix). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1988c). Remapping the moral domain: New images of self in relationship. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor with B. Bardige (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education (pp.3-19). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1988d). Remapping the moral domain: New images of self in relationship. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor with B. Bardige (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education (pp.3-19). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1994). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. B. Puka. (Ed.). New York: Garland. (Original work published 1977)

Gilligan, C., & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor with B. Bardige (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education (pp.73-86). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., & Belenky, M. F. (1980/1994). A naturalistic study of abortion decisions. B. Puka, (Ed.). New York: Garland.

Gilligan, C., & Murphy, J. M. (1979). Development from adolescence to adulthood: The philosopher and the "dilemma of the fact." In D. Kuhn (Ed.), Intellectual development beyond childhood (pp. 85-99). New Directions for Child Development, No. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

EST COPY AVAILABL

Gilligan, C., & Pollak, S. (1988). The vulnerable and invulnerable physician. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor with B. Bardige (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education (pp.245-262). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hafner, K. (2001, June 28). Lessons in internet plagiarism. New York Times. [On-line]. Available: http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/28/technology/28CHEA.html ?pagewanted=print

Haines, V. J., Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., & Clark, R. E. (1986). College cheating: Immaturity, lack of commitment, and the neutralizing attitude. Research in Higher Education, 25, 342-352.

Hall, T. (1996). Honor among students. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, AAC 9640120.

Held, V. (1998). Feminist transformations of moral theory. In S. M. Cahn & P. Markie (Eds.), Ethics: History, theory, and contemporary issues (pp. 682-699). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hendershott, A., Drinan, P. F., & Cross, M. (1999). Gender and academic integrity, 40, Journal of College Student Development, 40, 345-354.

Holcomb, T. (1992). A case study analysis of honor codes at six institutions. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, AAC 9640120.

Huberman, A. M., & Crandall, D. P. (1982). Fitting words to numbers: multisite/multimethod research in educational dissemination. American Behavioral Science, 26, 1, 62-83.

Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reactions to academic dishonesty. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 401-406.

Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students' reactions to academic dishonesty. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 260-273.

Johnston, D. K. (1996). Cheating: limits of individual integrity. Journal of Moral Education, 25, 159-171.

Jones, C. E., & Watt, J. D. (1999). Psychosocial development and moral orientation among traditional-aged college students. NASPA Journal, 39, 1-13.

Kansas State University Fact Book 2000. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Office of Planning and Analysis, Anderson Hall, Room 226 (http://www.ksu.edu/pa/)

K-State Phone Book with E-Mail Listings 1999-2000. Manhattan, KS: Student Publications, Inc.

Keller, J. R. (1976). Today's student: Villain or victim? Phi Delta Kappan, 58, 330.

Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. NASPA Journal, 31, 8-18.

Kibler, W. L. (1994). Addressing academic dishonesty: What are institutions of higher education doing and not doing? NASPA Journal, 31, 92-101.

Kibler, W. L. (1998). The academic dishonesty of college students: The prevalence of the problem and effective educational prevention programs. In D. D. Burnett, L. Rudolf, & K. O. Clifford (Eds.), Academic integrity matters (pp.23-37). Washington D. C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Kibler, W. L., Nuss, E. M., Paterson, B. G., & Pavela, G. (1988). Academic integrity and student development: Legal issues and policy perspectives. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.

Kohlberg, L. (1967). Moral and religious education and the public schools: A developmental view. In T. Sizer (Ed.), Religion and public education (pp. 164-183). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues. (pp. 31-53). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). Essays on moral development: Vol. 1. The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays in moral development, Vol. 2: The psychology of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L. (1985). A just community approach to moral education in theory and practice. In M. Berkowitz & F. Ozer (Eds.), Moral education: Theory and practice (pp. 27-87). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kohlberg, L. (1987). Child psychology and childhood education: A cognitive-developmental view. New York: Longman.

Kohlberg, L. (1958/1994). Kohlberg's original study of moral development. B. Puka, (Ed.). New York: Garland. (Original work published 1958)

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics. In J. A. Meacham (Ed.), Contributions to Human Development, Vol. 10. Basel, NY: Karger.

EST COPY AVAILABL

Krathwohl, D. R. (1993). Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Krueger, R. A. (1994). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Sage.

Lampkin, P. M., & Gibson, E. M. (1999). Mountains and passes: Traversing the landscape of ethics and student affairs administration. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

LeCompte, M. D., & Presissle, J. (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Levine, J. H. (2001, March-April). What we are learning about academic integrity. About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience, 6, (1), 9-16.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, NJ: Sage Publications.

Lipson, A., & McGavern, N. (1993). Undergraduate academic dishonesty at MIT: Results of a study of attitudes and behavior of undergraduates, faculty, and graduate teaching assistants. (A report to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Community). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED368 272)

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1995). Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis. (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ludeman, R. B. (1988). A survey of academic integrity practices in U.S. higher education. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 172-173.

Manning, R. C. (1992). *Speaking from the heart: A feminist perspective on ethics.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of student honor codes. *Research in Higher Education, 34,* 647-658.

McCabe, D. L. (2000, May 15). New research on academic integrity: The success of 'modified' honor codes. *Synfax Weekly Report, Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education,* 975-977.

McCabe, D., & Bowers, W.J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective. *Journal of College Student Development, 35,* 5-10.

McCabe, D., & Drinan. (1999, October 15). Toward a culture of academic integrity. *Chronicle of Higher Education, v 45.*

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*, 522-538.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996, January/February). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change,* 28-33.

McMurtry, Kim. (2001, November). *e-cheating: Combating a 21st century challenge.* [On-line]. Available: http://www.thejournal.com/magazine/vault/A3724.cfm

Michaels, J. W., & Miethe, T. D. (1989). Applying theories of deviance to academic cheating. *Social Science Quarterly, 70,* 870-885.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moffatt, M. (1990). *Undergraduate cheating.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED334 921).

Morgan, D. L. (1997). Focus groups as qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mulligan, R.C., Friedman, J.I., Halle, M., Wogan, G.N., & Widnall, S.E. (1992). Fostering academic integrity. Report of the Committee on Academic Responsibility. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Nuss, E. M. (1984). Academic integrity: Comparing faculty and student attitudes. Improving College & University Teaching, 32, 140-144.

O'Neill, C. (1994, November 11). Letter to the Editor: Class sizes should be smaller. Kansas State Collegian, p. 4.

Paldy, L. G. (1996). The problem that won't go away: Addressing the causes of cheating. Journal of College Science Teaching, 26, 4-6.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Paul, R. (1998). Critical thinking: Why it must be at the heart of ethics instruction. Journal of Developmental Education, 22, 32.

Pavela, G. (1993). Academic integrity: What the latest research shows. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 5, 340-343.

Pavela, G., & McCabe, D. (1993). The surprising return of honor codes. Planning for Higher Education, 21, 27-32.

Perry, Jr., W. G. (1968/1999). Forms of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pownell, D. W., & Bailey, G. D. (2001, June). Getting a handle on handhelds: What to consider before you introduce handheld computers in your schools. electronic school, 18-21, 48.

Pratt, C. B., & McLaughlin, G. W. (1989). An analysis of predictors of college students' ethical inclinations. Research in Higher Education, 30, 195-219.

Primetime Live (1994, November 3, 10 p.m.). WABC/ABC, Diane Sawyer and Sam Donaldson. American Broadcasting System.

QSR NUD*IST 4 User Guide, (2nd Ed). (1997). Australia: Qualitative Solutions and Research Pty Ltd.

Rachels, J. (1998). In S. M. Cahn & P. Markie (Eds.), Ethics: History, theory, and contemporary issues (pp. 669-681). New York: Oxford University Press.

Rest, J. R. (1979). Development in judging moral issues. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rest, J. R. (1986a). Moral development: Advances in research and theory. New York: Praeger.

Rest, J. R. (1986b). Moral development in young adults. In R. A. Mines & K. S. Kitchener, Adult cognitive development (pp. 92-111). New York: Praeger.

Rest, J. R., & Narvaez, D. (1991). The college experience and moral development. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), Handbook of moral behavior and development: Volume 2 (pp. 229-245). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rest, J. R., & Narvaez, D. (1994). Summary: What's possible? In J. R. Rest, & D. Narvaez, (Eds.), Moral development in the professions: Psychology and applied ethics (pp. 213-224). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rintoul, D. (1994, November 9). Letter to the Editor: Students: show more responsibility. Kansas State Collegian, p. 4.

Rittman, A. L. (1996). Academic dishonesty among college students. [On-line]. Available: http://www.psych.mwsc.edu/research

Rodabaugh, R. C., & Kravitx, D. A. (1994). Effects of procedural fairness on student judgments of professors. Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 5 (2), 67-84.

Roig, M., & Ballew, C. (1992). Attitudes toward cheating by college students and professors. St. John's University (Poster presented at the 63rd annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, MA). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED349 895)

Roth, N. L., & McCabe, D. L. (1995). Communication strategies for addressing dishonesty. Journal of College Student Personnel, 36, 531-541.

Roufa, D. (1994, November 7). Letter: Not an instructor's job. Kansas State Collegian, p. 4.

Rudolph, R. (1962/1990). The American college and university: A History. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Seidman, I. E. (1998). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sierles, F. S., Kushner, B. D., & Krause, P. B. (1988). A controlled experiment with a medical student honor system. Journal of Medical Education, 63, 705-712.

Smith, A. G., & Robbins, A. E. (1982). Structured ethnography: the study of parental involvement. American Behavioral Scientist, 26, 1, 45-61.

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (1990). Focus groups: Theory and practice (Applied Social Research Methods Series, 20). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tankersley, K. C. (1997). Academic integrity from a student's perspective. Journal of Dental Education, 61, 692-693.

Taylor, J. M., Gilligan, C., & Sullivan, A. M. (1995). Between voice and silence: Women and girls, race and relationship. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Thoma, S. J., & Rest, J. R. (with Barnett, R.). (1986). Moral judgment, behavior, decision making, and attitudes. In J. R. Rest (1986). Moral development: Advances in research and theory (133-175). New York: Praeger.

Thomas, L. (1994, November 8). Letter to the Editor: Department cheated innocent students. Kansas State Collegian, p. 4.

Vines, E. L. (1996). Honor codes at schools and colleges of pharmacy. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 60, 348-352.

Webster's Universal College Dictionary. (1997). New York: Random House.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods. (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weiss, K. R. (2000, February 15). Focus on ethics can curb cheating, colleges find. Los Angeles Times, pp A1-A2, A18.

Wright, C. (1994, November). Cheating case comes to a close. Kansas State Collegian, p. 1.

Yagoda, B. (2002, January 18). Quote, unquote. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. B18.

Zoll, M. J. (1996). A matter of honor: Do students understand and uphold the honor code? (Doctoral dissertation, University of LaVerne, 1996) Dissertation Abstracts International, AAC 9720835.

APPENDIX A

Kansas State University Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Academic Dishonesty Survey

Academic Dishonesty:

What's my role in talking about cheating? What do I say? What do I do?

A few days ago you received an e-mail asking you to consider completing a questionnaire about academic integrity. Pilot testing suggests it takes an average of **7 minutes** to complete this questionnaire. Answering **YES** to both these questions allows you to continue with the questionnaire.

1. Are you a full time faculty member at Kansas State University's main campus?

2. Have you taught at least two sections of primarily (over 50%) undergraduate students in any of the last four academic semesters (Fall 1999, Spring 2000, Fall 2000, Spring 2001)?

If you answered NO to either question, please send this questionnaire back without answering any questions. I thank you for your time.
Please start the questionnaire on the following page.

Much of the research on academic dishonesty (cheating) focuses on the behaviors and attitudes of students. Here is an opportunity for you, the faculty of undergraduate students, to share your beliefs about and methods of handling dishonesty in academia.

Your input will add to a better understanding of how faculty:

(1) view their role in disseminating information about cheating;
(2) communicate with students about academic dishonesty;
(3) resolve academic dishonesty; and
(4) view students' ethical development in relation to academic dishonesty.

I assure you your comments will be completely **confidential**. For this reason I ask that you are completely honest and candid. It is important that this information be as accurate as is possible.The survey will be used for background material for a QUALITATIVE dissertation study on academic integrity at KSU as it relates to faculty.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the address, phone, or e-mail below.

Helene Marcoux
215 Fairchild Hall
785-532-2595
hem3848@ksu.edu

Part I Academic Dishonesty (Cheating) Information

Q-1 Are you familiar with Kansas State University's Undergraduate Honor System policy on student academic misconduct? (*Please circle one numeral.*)

1 Yes (Go to Q-3)
2 No (Go to Q-4)

Q-2 On a continuum from 1 to 10 (with 1 being not too familiar with and 10 being very familiar with), how familiar are you with Kansas State University's Undergraduate Honor System policy on student academic misconduct? (*Please circle one numeral.*)

Not Too Familiar With									Very Familiar With
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Q-3 In my opinion, a teacher should take class time to discuss what constitutes academic dishonesty.(*Please circle one numeral.*)

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree
3 Disagree
4 Strongly disagree

Q-4 In my opinion, students generally come to college knowing what constitutes cheating in the classroom. (*Please circle one numeral.*)

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree
3 Disagree
4 Strongly disagree

Q-5 In my opinion, a teacher should give written instructions about what constitutes academic dishonesty. (*Please circle one numeral.*)

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree
3 Disagree
4 Strongly disagree

Q-6 Students in my classes ask questions about what constitutes cheating in the classroom. (*Please circle one numeral.*)

1 Often
2 Seldom
3 Never

Q-7 What three words or what phrase comes to mind when you see the term "academic dishonesty?" (Write words or a phrase in the boxes provided.)

..........**Please continue on the following page**.........

EST COPY AVAILABLE

Part II Disseminating Information about Academic Dishonesty

This part concerns disseminating information about cheating to undergraduate students in your classes. Each question in Part II and Part III refers to the last four academic semesters (a period inclusive of fall semester 1999 to spring semester 2001). For the purpose of these questions, please define cheating in terms of violating KSU's Undergraduate Honor System Honor Pledge: "On my honor, as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on academic work."

Q-8 HOW did you disseminate information about cheating to your students ? (*Please circle ALL numerals that apply.*)

1 Made verbal announcements to the total class
2 Placed a statement in my class syllabus
3 Conversed with one to two students (face to face)
4 In a phone conversation with a student
5 Conversed with a group of more than two students
6 Sent an e-mail message to the student(s)
7 Referred student(s) to policy in *Inside KSU*
8 Referred student(s) to K-State's Honor System web page at (www.ksu.edu/honor)
9 Other______________________________
10 Did not do any of the above

Q-9 How much time (if any) did you spend talking with students in your classes about what constitutes academic dishonesty? (*Please write out your answer in minutes for a typical course.*)

Approximately______________________minutes

Q-10 WHEN did you disseminate information about cheating to students ? (*Please circle ALL numerals that apply.*)

1 When I handed out the syllabus
2 Within the first week of classes
3 When I discussed an academic assignment
4 When a student asked specific questions about cheating
5 Before any student assessment (project, paper, quiz, test, exam)
6 Other______________________________
7 Did not disseminate information about cheating
8 No response

Q-11 On which of the following (if any) did you place the Honor System Honor Pledge? (*Please circle ALL numerals that apply.*)

1 Course syllabi
2 Course assignments
3 Course examinations (not including final)
4 Course final
5 Other______________________
6 Did not put the Pledge on any of the above
7 No response

Part III Addressing Academic Dishonesty or Cheating Incidents

Q-12 Are you aware of any cheating incident(s) occurring in your courses during the last four academic semesters--Fall 1999 through Spring 2001. (*Please circle one numeral.*)

1. No (Go to Q-15)
2. Yes, and sanctioned violator(s) (Go to Q-13)
3. Yes, and did not sanction violators(s) (Go to Q-13)
4. I suspect, but don't know for certain (Go to Q-13)

Q-13 Which of the following types of cheating (if any) occurred? (*Please circle ALL numerals that apply and check (√) the class size in which this violation occurred.*)

	# of Students in Class		
Type of Cheating	5-20	21-50	over 50
1 Plagiarism on any assignment	____	____	____
2 Unauthorized collaboration on any assignment	____	____	____
3 Copying exam answers	____	____	____
4 Copying another student's assignment and turning it in	____	____	____
5 Using unauthorized materials during a quiz	____	____	____
6 Using unauthorized materials during an exam	____	____	____
7 Using unauthorized materials during the final	____	____	____
8 Other______________________________	____	____	____

Q-14 What type(s) of sanctions did you use (*Circle ALL numerals that apply.*)

1 Reported incident to Honor System Director
2 Gave a warning
3 Gave a failing grade on the test or assignment
4 Gave an XF in the course (F due to dishonesty)
5 Placed incident report in student's file
6 Recommended suspension from University
7 Recommended expulsion from University
8 Other______________________________
9 Other______________________________
10 No sanction(s) given
11 No response

In the following four questions, please circle one of the letters signifying **strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD).**

In my opinion:

Q-15 When a student has been found cheating, an instructor should take time to discuss the episode with the student.

SA A D SD

Q-16 In general, students guilty of cheating and sanctioned learn from the experience.

SA A D SD

Q-17 In general, once a cheater--always a cheater.

SA A D SD

Q-18 In general, I believe part of my job as an instructor is to help students learn ethical behavior.

SA A D SD

EST COPY AVAILABLE

***Important to my qualitative research:**
If you would be willing to talk with me briefly about any incident(s), (without using student-identifying information), please email or call me at the contact information on the front page. If you use the phone, you need NOT identify yourself. Simply use the phrase, "For your research, I can relate a personal episode of how I handled student cheating."

Scenarios

Q-19 A student is in the Student Union discussing with a close friend an essay test taken in History at 8 a.m. Two tables over, overhearing the conversation, is another student who will take the test in another History section at 2 p.m. Would you consider the first student talking to her friend to be cheating? (*Circle one.*)
1 Yes 2 No 3 No response

Q-20 A student uses the same book review for two different classes. Would you consider this cheating?
1 Yes 2 No 3 No response

Q-21 A student studies an old test in a Greek house file. Would you consider this cheating?
1 Yes 2 No 3 No response

Q-22 A student completes three science lab reports, withdraws from the class due to sickness, reenrolls another semester, and uses the same reports again. Would you consider this cheating?
1 Yes 2 No 3 No response

Part IV About Yourself as Faculty

Q-23 How many years have you taught undergraduate students at KSU?

__________full time years equivalent

Q-24 In what discipline(s) at KSU did you teach in the last four academic semesters. (*Please write in space provided.*)

____

Q-25 Which of the following TYPES of classes with undergraduate students did you teach in the last four academic semesters at KSU? (*Circle ALL numerals that apply.*)

1 Lower division
2 Upper division

3 Under 20 students in the class
4 21-50 students in the class
5 Over 50 students in the class

6 Required general education course
7 Introductory or survey course
8 Required course in a program

Q-26 Have you received training or orientation in addressing academic dishonesty? (*Circle one numeral.*)

1 Yes (Go to Q-27)
3 No response (Go to Q-28)
2 No (Go to Q-28)

Q-27 In what manner did this training or orientation take place? *(Circle **ALL** numerals that apply.)*

1 Workshop or Seminar   3 Orientation to university/dept

2 Faculty Handbook   4 Other ________________

Q-28 Are you presently tenured? (*Circle one numeral.*)

1 Yes
2 No

Q-29-31 What descriptors listed below come closest to describing the undergraduate institution in which you received **your baccalaureate degree?**
(*Please circle one numeral in __EACH__ __CATEGORY__.*)

Q-29 __Carnegie Class__

1 Research
2 Comprehensive
3 Liberal Arts
4 Specialized
5 Other_____
6 No response

Q-30 __Type of Governance__

1 Public
2 Private-church
3 Private-non church
4 Other_____
5 No response

Q-31 Approximate Student Population

1 Under 5,000   2 5,000-10,000   3 Over 10,000

Q-32 What is your gender? (*Please circle one numeral.*)
1 Female
2 Male

Q-33 What is your ethnicity? (*Please write in space provided.*)

____

Q-34 What is your US citizenship status? (*Circle one numeral.*)

1 US Citizen
2 Other____________

Q-35 What rank do you hold? (*Circle one numeral.*)

1. Instructor   2. Assistant   3. Associate   4. Professor

THANK YOU
FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ANSWER
THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!

Use any of the contact information below should you need clarification or further information:

Michael Dannells
Major Professor
Bluemont Hall 322
785-532-5936

Clive Fullagar, Chair
Committee on Research
Involving Human Subject
1 Fairchild Hall
785-532-3224

APPENDIX B

Kansas State University Undergraduate Teaching Faculty Academic Dishonesty Study

Participant Matrix and College and Department Representation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Participants in KSU Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty Study
(Legend for colleges on following page)*

Participants	#Involved	Colleges*	Gender	Rank/Class	Ethnicity
2-Focus Groups Purpose: Critique Survey	7 Present 2 Absent 1 Disqualified	Ag-1 Arch-1 A/S-2 BA-0 Ed-1 En-1 HE-1	3-Females 4-Males	0-Instructor 1-Assistant 3-Associate 3-Professor	7-Caucasian 0-Asian 0-Hispanic 0-African Amer 0-Native Amer 0-Other
Survey-Returned	368 Usable 145 Disqualified	Ag-54 Arch-23 A/S-166 BA-27 Ed-22 En-46 HE-29 Unknown-1	109-Females 257-Males 2-Unknown	28-Instructor 82-Assistant 108-Associate 147-Professor	303-Caucasian 7-Asian 5-Hispanic 2-African Am 3-Native Am 12-Other 36-No Resp
Non-Participant Classroom Observation	16-Usable 2 Disqualified	Ag-2 Arch-2 A/S-4 BA-2 Ed-2 En-2 HE-2 Unknown-0	6-Females 10-Males	3-Instructor 3-Assistant 4-Associate 6-Professor	16-Caucasian 0-Asian 0-Hispanic 0-African Amer 0-Native Amer 0-Other
Other Interviews Purpose: History of Honor System	2 Faculty 1 Staff 2 Administrators	A/S	2-Females 3-Males	1-Instructor 0-Assistant 0-Associate 1-Professor 2-Administrator 1-Staff	5-Caucasian 0-Asian 0-Hispanic 0-African Amer 0-Native Amer 0-Other

Participants in KSU Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty Study-continued

Participants	#Involved	Colleges*	Gender	Rank/Class	Ethnicity
Survey Faculty Interviews	13 Faculty	Ag-2 Arch-2 A/S-5 BA-1 Ed-1 En-1 HE-1	5-Females 8-Males	3-Instructor 2-Assistant 5-Associate 3-Professor	13-Caucasian 0-Asian 0-Hispanic 0-African Amer 0-Native Amer 0-Other

***Legend on Colleges**

Ag= College of Agriculture
Arch= College of Architecture, Planning, and Design
A/S= College of Arts and Sciences
BA= College of Business Administration
Ed= College of Education
En= College of Engineering
HE= College of Human Ecology

. Survey Participant Profile by College: Kansas State University Full-time Undergraduate Teaching Faculty in 7 Colleges

College	# of Survey Participants n=368	% in Population
Agriculture	54	14.7
Architecture, Planning, & Design	23	6.3
Arts & Sciences	166	45.1
Business Administration	27	7.3
Education	22	6.0
Engineering	47	12.8
Human Ecology	28	7.6
Unknown	1	.3

College of Agriculture	Number of Respondents
Agriculture-General	6
Agricultural Economics	9
Animal Science	9
Agronomy	7
Food Science	2
Grain Science	8
Agricultural Communication	1
Entomology	4
Forestry	1
Genetics	1
Natural Resources	2
Dairy Science	1
Park Management	1
Range Management	1
Horticulture	1
Total	54

College of Architecture, Planning & Design	Number of Respondents
Architecture-General	13
Interior Architecture	5
Landscape Architecture	5
Total	23

College of Arts and Sciences	Number of Respondents
Arts and Sciences-General	7
Art	2
Biochemistry	3
Biology	17
Chemistry	9
Economics	8

English/English Literature	23
Geography	7
Geology	2
History	8
Journalism, Mass Comm., & Public Relations	9
Kinesiology	6
Mathematics/Statistics	7
Military Science/Aerospace Studies	4
Modern Languages	4
Music/Fine Arts/Humanities	13
Philosophy	1
Physics	7
Political Science	7
Psychology	7
Sociology, Anthropology, & Social Work	7
Speech Communication, Theater, & Dance	8
Total	**166**

College of Business Administration	**Number of Respondents**
Business-General	4
Accounting	7
Management	8
Marketing	6
Finance	2
Total	**27**

College of Education	Number of Respondents
Education-General	9
Educational Psychology	2
Elementary Education	4
Secondary Education	4
Special Education	3
Total	**22**

College of Engineering	Number of Respondents
Engineering-General	9
Architectural/Construction Science Mangmt	3
Biological and Agricultural	5
Chemical	7
Civil	2
Computing and Informational Sciences	7
Electrical and Computer	8
Industrial and Manufacturing Systems	2
Mechanical and Nuclear	3
Environmental	1
Total	**47**

College of Human Ecology	Number of Respondents
Human Ecology-General	5
Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design	7
Communication Sciences and Disorders	2
Family Studies and Human Services	9
Hotel, Restaurant, and Dietetics	2
Human Nutrition	3
Total	**28**

APPENDIX C

Email #1 Survey

Email #1 Sent 3/26/01

In a few days you will receive a survey through campus mail which will take only 7 MINUTES to complete. It concerns college and university cheating. I am interested in gaining more information from the faculty perspective.

If you are a member of the Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty, please seriously consider completing this survey. An addressed campus envelope will be included for your convenience. Your participation is completely voluntary and confidentiality will be maintained. This survey IS sanctioned by the Committee on Research of Human Subjects.

I am thanking you in advance for representing your department in this survey.

Gratefully,

Helene

APPENDIX D

Email #2 Survey

Email #2 Sent 4/5/01

A couple of weeks ago I sent out a questionnaire about academic dishonesty. I hope you receieved your copy and took time to fill it out.

If you need another copy or would like to answer the questions over the phone, please contact me at the information below. If you have already sent your questionnaire back, thank you for your participation!

The return rate at this point in the survey is encouraging. The breakdown is as follows: Agriculture (39.15%), Architecture (31.37%), Arts & Sciences (36.39%), Business Administration (45.24%), Education (46.00%), Engineering (29.36%), and Human Ecology (46.27%). I hope this doesn't sound like a United Fund plea to reach 100%, however I would like to make certain all colleges are well represented.

And, if you DID NOT QUALIFY to fill out the questionnaire because you do not teach or you teach only graduate students, thank you to those who have sent it back unanswered. I have no way of knowing who falls into that category unless you do so.

Appreciatively,

Helene

APPENDIX E

Email #3 Survey

Email #3 sent on 4/15/01

I thank all of you who participated in returning the questionnaire on academic dishonesty—whether filled in OR "disqualified" due to ineligibility in faculty status. This is the final "follow-up" email I will send.

At this point in the survey, the response rate for each of the colleges (cutoff day will be April 30) is as follows: Agriculture (52.38%), Architecture (43.14%), Arts & Sciences (50.14%), Business Administration (65.85%), Education (68.75%), Engineering (42.86%), and Human Ecology (68.25%).

If you haven't filled in your questionnaire, there is still time. If you lost it OR put it in File 13, I am MOST happy to hand carry another one to your office or department office. Simply call me. (532-2595-office or 537-4561-home)

MANY of you have written comments on the questionnaire and those comments are VERY IMPORTANT to the qualitative aspect of my study. A good number of KSU faculty have also called and emailed me about personal episodes of academic dishonesty and how you handled those. These also are critical to the study.

I should be done writing the dissertation this August and will email all of you again in the fall with a web site at which you can access part of the results. Much of this survey will be displayed there.

THANK YOU for contributing your precious time to helping me understand how KSU faculty relate to students' academic dishonesty—perceptions and practices. I hope to package these perceptions and practices in an "after dissertation" message to students as well!

Most appreciatively,

Helene

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F

Email #4 Survey

Email #4 Sent 5/2/01
Targeted Discipline Department-

One month ago I sent out a questionnaire about academic dishonesty. I am now targeting faculty of curriculums NOT representative in the survey.

By now, many of you who did not fill it in and send it back have probably thrown it away. I have copies remaining and would like to hear from more instructors in this discipline. Please, help me reach a more acceptable response rate, and in turn a more accurate idea of what faculty in your discipline think.

Reply to this email and I will send another questionnaire immediately. If you would rather answer the questions over the phone, please call me at the contact information below.

I sincerely thank you!

Helene

APPENDIX G

Focus Group and Survey Participant Contact Sheet

Participant Contact Sheet

Name:
College:
Discipline:
Campus Phone:
Campus Office Number and Building:
Are you a full time faculty member on the main KSU campus? (Circle) **yes** **no**
How many years have you taught undergraduate students at KSU? _________
Have you taught at least two sections of predominantly (over 50%) undergraduate students in the period of one academic year in the last 2 years? (Circle) **yes** **no**
How many of the following TYPES of classes with undergraduate students did you teach in the last two years (check off as many as apply):
_____5-20 students in class _____21-50 students in class _____over 50 students in class

I am asking these next questions in order to ascertain your gender, your ethnicity, and your US citizenship status. These are optional and please **feel free to decline to answer**.
What is your gender? **male** **female**
What is your ethnicity?________________________________
What is your US citizen'ship status? US citizen
Other_________________________

Student Dyads

I would like to have a conversation about academic integrity with two students from any of your classes. If you agree, I will consult your class roll and randomly select two students—one male and one female. **May I talk to two undergraduate students in any of the classes you teach this fall?** (circle one) **yes** **no**

I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME TODAY!

APPENDIX H

Focus Group Informed Consent Sheet

Informed Consent Form for Focus Group Participation

Date
Faculty's Name
Faculty's Campus Address
Dr.____________:

Academic integrity is critical to the very fabric of higher education, where the quest for truth is manifested in research and learning. Yet, recent studies conducted on the evidence of academic dishonesty in collegiate settings and the perceptions held by students, administrators, and faculty have been disheartening. Much of the knowledge base involving college and university cheating concerns student behavior. I am interested in gaining more information from the faculty perspective.

You are a member of the Kansas State University undergraduate teaching faculty. It is important that faculty have a voice in research concerning cheating at the collegiate level and your participation in this focus group is much needed and will add vital information to that body of knowledge. Your participation, at the beginning and throughout, is completely voluntary and confidentiality will be maintained to the maximum extent allowable by law. There are no known risks in participating in this research project. Use any of the contact information below should you need clarification or further information.

Helene E. Marcoux
215 Fairchild
785-532-2595

Dr. Michael Dannells
Major Professor
322 Bluemont Hall
785-532-5936

Clive Fullagar, Chair
Committee Research Human Subjects
1 Fairchild Hall
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506
(785) 532-3224

I thank you sincerely for taking part in this focus group. Your voice as an undergraduate teaching faculty member is extremely important to this research.

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary, and that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time, and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled.

I also understand that my signature below indicates that I have read this consent form and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described, and that my signature acknowledges that I have received a signed and dated copy of this consent form.

Participant Name:________________________________
Participant Signature:________________________________Date:____________
Witness to Signature:_____________________________Date:________________

APPENDIX I

Focus Group Question Guide

Focus Group Question Guide

Research Objectives:

Primary: The purpose of my study is to have selected faculty in number of focus groups dialogue about academic integrity. The basic question driving the research is "What meaning do faculty here at K-State make of academic dishonesty?" I want to find out how faculty view cheating in order to understand how these views contribute to the culture of academic integrity on this campus.

Secondary: Another purpose that drives this study is to design a research questionnaire using the results of analyzed focus group results. The questionnaire will then be used with the population of full time undergraduate teaching faculty at Kansas State University.

Question Outline

I. Welcome with introductions of participants. Ask faculty to give an idea of the types of classes you teach, number of students, classes per semester.

II. Please read and sign the consent form at your place setting

III. Also, please check and correct the information at the top of the Participant Contact Sheet under the consent form, then furnish the information needed.

IV. Ground rules and expectations for the focus group include:

> **A. I am taping this session because I don't trust my notetaking and because I want to be fully focused on you as you speak. Irene will be jotting down the starting phrases as you speak to help with transcribing the tapes.**
>
> **B. Transcribing tapes can be very difficult if more than one voice can be heard. I ask that as much as possible only one person speaks at a time.**
>
> **C. I ask that you not edit your thoughts or comments-please speak freely. I ask also that you feel free to comment on one another's comments.**
>
> **D. My role in the discussion is very limited today. I am here to hear you. I should not smile or nod during these sessions, but that will be extremely difficult for me, having been trained as a counselor.**

V. Opening question

"I have held three focus groups with faculty such as yourself. After gathering and analyzing faculty thoughts and perceptions about academic integrity, I have constructed this questionnaire. I plan to use this questionnaire next semester with full time faculty who instruct undergraduate students. My goal today is to have you complete the questionnaire and then respond to its form, but more important to its content. Please take the next 5 to 10 minutes to complete the survey."

VI. Introductory question

> *A. "First, I would like to illicit comments about the form and to start, what are your thoughts and feelings about the color coding scheme?"*

VII. Transition question

> *A. Secondly, please comment about issues of form, keeping comments about content for later. Issues such as spacing, innumeration of options, general appearance, time to complete, etc. would be appropriate at this time."*

VIII. Key questions

> *A. "Now, we will move to comments about the content. Issues with choice of wording, concepts, the scenario, confidentiality issues, etc. are appropriate."*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. "Specifically, I want to illicit information about how faculty view student development in moral judgment (in relation to academic dishonesty). Is there any other way I might address that issue in questionnaire form?"
C. "At this time I would like to open the conversation to have you address how you yourselves have handled episodes of dishonesty in your teaching career. You may also expound on any of the questions raised in the questionnaire."

IX. Ending questions

A. "What sticks out most in your mind about todays conversation?"

X. Last comment

A. I appreciate your time and constructive comments today. When I conclude the analysis of this focus group transcript, I will share that with you for assessment of accuracy. Thanks once again.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX J

Faculty Interview Protocol

Faculty Interview Protocol

Research Objectives:

Primary: The purpose of this part of my study is to interview survey faculty who have agreed to relate a personal experience in handling a cheating episode. Each faculty has voluntarily called or emailed me stating they are willing to talk about a time when dishonesty occurred and how he or she dealt with the situation.

Secondary: Another purpose that drives this section of the study is to triangulate information obtained in the focus groups.

Name of Faculty (if given)____
How contacted? email phone other____________________
Rank__________________Phone__________________Email________________
Date of Interview____________________Time of Interview___________________
Room__________Bldg______________________________
Brief description of episode and how faculty handled it:

# of students involved__________ # of students in class__________

Why do you believe this happened?
What were your thoughts throughout the process?
What were your feelings throughout the process?
Looking back, would there be anything you would change about how you handled it?
In your opinion, was the student changed by your actions?
Do you talk with students about your expectations?
In your opinion, do you have a good rapport with students in general?
Have you used the Honor System?
What is your opinion of it's procedures?
If you had a message you wanted to give students about academic integrity, what would that message be?

"I appreciate your time and constructive comments today. When I conclude the analysis of this study, I will share that with you for assessment of accuracy. Thanks once again."

APPENDIX K

Faculty Interview Informed Consent Form

Date
Participant Name:

Academic integrity is critical to the very fabric of higher education, where the quest for truth is manifested in research and learning. Yet, recent studies conducted on the evidence of academic dishonesty in collegiate settings and the perceptions held by students, administrators, and faculty have been disheartening. Much of the knowledge base involving college and university cheating concerns student behavior. I am interested in gaining more information from the faculty perspective.

Your participation in this interview is much needed and will add vital information to that body of knowledge having to do with academic integrity. Your participation, at the beginning and throughout, is completely voluntary and confidentiality will be maintained to the maximum extent allowable by law. There are no known risks in participating in this research project.

Use any of the contact information below should you need clarification or further information.

Helene E. Marcoux
215 Fairchild
785-532-2595

Dr. Michael Dannells
Major Professor
322 Bluemont Hall
785-532-5936

Clive Fullagar, Chair
Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects
1 Fairchild Hall
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506
(785) 532-3224

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary, and that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time, and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled.

I also understand that my signature below indicates that I have read this consent form and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described, and that my signature acknowledges that I have received a signed and dated copy of this consent form.

Participant Name:
Participant Signature:______________________________Date:________________
Witness to Signature:______________________________Date:________________

APPENDIX L

Non-participant Classroom Observation Summary Sheet

Non-participant Classroom Observation Summary Sheet
Summer 2000-Spring 2001

Date_________________________Semester____________________

Time_________________________Building____________________

Room________________Instructor__________________________

Class____

Approximate Number of Students___________________________

Syllabus______________________________

HC Pledge______________________________

Explanation in Syllabus of Integrity Policy_____________

Explanation about Integrity-verbal______________________

Notes:

APPENDIX M

Non-participant Classroom Observation Informed Consent

June 25, 2001

Dear Faculty Member,

I am attaching a consent form that I would ask you to read carefully. In it, I explain the research I conducted in your classroom some time between summer semester 2000 and spring semester 2001.

At my proposal meeting in March 2000, I asked my committee if I should garner permission to sit in on classes to listen to the communication of academic dishonesty policies. It was suggested at that time that I need not, as I was just sitting listening like any student who would consider taking the class or not. Upon reflection, and since I did take notes and take syllabi as supporting documents, I have decided that the ethical thing to do is get permission (albeit in hindsight) for using any material I wrote down and using the experience in general in my dissertation.

Please consider granting me that permission. I received a rich combination of experiences in conducting these "non-participant" observations. And I must add that I have heard at times that education is sometimes referred to as "wasted on the young." I not only conducted my research, I also, in many instances, sat enthralled by lectures I so foolishly passed off in my youth as "that stuff I will never use." As an offshoot to my dissertation research, I have come to realize K-State students are lucky to have instructors such as you.

I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Helene Marcoux, Graduate Teaching Assistant
Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System
Kansas State University
hem3848@ksu.edu

enclosures

APPENDIX N

Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System Violation Report

Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System
Violation Report
CONFIDENTIAL
Click Here To See: Student Records and Student's Rights
An At-a-Glance guide to Federal and University Policy

This form may be used for two purposes.

One: Faculty may handle Honor Pledge violations on their own and send this completed report to be filed in the Honor System office in 215 Fairchild
(Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning). The report will remain in the files until the student graduates. Should a report on the same student
be filed by another faculty member, the Honor Director may initiate an investigation by Honor Council members. Please refer to the Honor System
homepage for Procedures Flowchart

Two: Faculty may refer an alleged violator(s) of the Honor Pledge to the Honor System Director. After receiving this completed form, the Director will
initiate an investigation by two Honor Council members.

IMPORTANT: This form may be printed off the Internet and then filled in and sent OR click here for pdf form to be filled in on computer and then printed
out OR click here to download Word document to type and print out.

CASE #________________________(To be filled in by Honor System Director.)
Date of Report:
Reporter Information
Name/Rank:
Department/Address:
Phone Number:
Email Address:
College:
Alleged Violator Information
Name(s) of Alleged Violator(s):
Student ID #:
Classification (Fr/So/Jr/Sr):
Address:
Phone Number:
Email Address:
Has student been notified of the right to appeal to the Honor System?
Course Information
Course Title:
Course Number:
Course Section Number:
Number of Students in Class:
Meets on:
GTA Involved:
Violation Information
Please provide a brief description of circumstances of suspected violation of the Honor Pledge (e.g., date of incident, location, facts leading to suspicion of
violation, names of witnesses, standing in class, syllabus information, sanctions given student). Please attach or mail COPIES of exams, papers, or other
relevant evidence. Retain originals for your own records in a secure location.

Submit reports to: Director of the Honor System, 215 Fairchild Hall (Center for Advancement of Teaching and Learning). If you have any questions
regarding alleged violation reports, please contact Phil Anderson at 785-532-6875 or Helene Marcoux at 785-532-2595.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX O

Approval of Proposal by Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects

Helen —
your copy
M

K·STATE
Kansas State University
University Research
Compliance Office
1 Fairchild Hall
Manhattan, KS 66506-1107
785-532-3224
Fax: 785-532-5944
http://www.ksu.edu/research/

Proposal Number: 2059

TO: Michael Dannells
Counseling & Educational Psychology
322 Bluemont Hall

FROM: Clive Fullagar, Chair
Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects

Clive Fullagar

DATE: September 29, 2000

RE: Approval of Proposal Entitled, "Academic Dishonesty in the College Classroom: A Perspective of Kansas State University Undergraduate Faculty."

The Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects has reviewed your proposal and has granted full approval.

In giving its approval, the Committee has determined that:

☒ There is no more than minimal risk to the subjects.
☐ There is greater than minimal risk to the subjects.

This approval applies only to the proposal currently on file. Any change affecting human subjects must be approved by the Committee prior to implementation. All approved proposals are subject to continuing review at least annually, which may include the examination of records connected with the project. Injuries or any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or to others must be reported immediately to the Chair of the Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, the University Research Compliance Office, and if the subjects are KSU students, to the Director of the Student Health Center.

Prior to involving human subjects, properly executed informed consent must be obtained from each subject or from an authorized representative, and documentation of informed consent must be kept on file for at least three years after the project ends. Each subject must be furnished with a copy of the informed consent document for his or her personal records. The identification of particular human subjects in any publication is an invasion of privacy and requires a separately executed informed consent.

It is important that your human subjects project is consistent with submissions to funding/contract entities. It is your responsibility to initiate notification procedures to any funding/contract entity of any changes in your project that affects the use of human subjects.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE